

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
Division of Fish and Wildlife
Endangered and Nongame Species Program

**SPECIES STATUS REVIEW OF
LAND BIRDS:
Printout of results from the
Delphi Review conducted in 2016-2017**

Review conducted and overseen by
Endangered and Nongame Species Program
NJDEP Division of Fish and Wildlife
Trenton, NJ
2020



Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 - 2017

Northern Bobwhite (*Colinus virginianus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Endangered

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	13	1	0	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF	6.2	5.0					

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Wild populations virtually gone; most birds reported are likely stocked. Combined with change in farming practices and loss of habitat this species should be considered endangered.(E)

Declines are widespread across the state with many sites appearing to show extirpation. This is complicated by stock released for hunting, but strong evidence supports the complex relationship between habitat and species decline.(E)

Essentially if not completely extirpated natural population. Some data on hunting totals, introduced stock, etc. would be helpful. (T)

NJ population possibly extirpated. Regionally declining species, and PIF Common Bird in Steep Decline(E)

The steep declines suggest that this species is in major trouble. The dramatic concerns expressed in a number of "SC" comments from Round 1 suggest Endangered-level concerns are shared among the reviewers.(E)

I changed from SC to E because overall population is thought to be so low. This is a very tough one for me to decide on because of re-stocking efforts that have already taken place.(E)

Native population possibly extirpated from NJ. Most recent sightings likely released birds.Reintroduction program begun.(E)

Drastic decline in the state and only hanging on where it's managed. Stocked birds for hunting are only making it more difficult to gauge the true status and doesn't help the wild population.(E)

I agree with these opinions. Perhaps it's time to really give this species the attention it deserves.(E)

Small, declining, disjunct NJ populations that depend on a habitat type that is uncommon and relatively short-lived (on a successional timeline). (E)

NJ Audubon states Bobwhite have been extirpated from the Pinelands since the late 1980s. Wild birds from Georgia have been transplanted to the Pine Island Cranberry property in 2015 and 2016.(E)

Very steep population declines. Based on PIF plan (2016), 83% of population has been lost and we could lose half the existing population in 10 years. Threats to the breeding population are high. Will likely become extirpated if nothing changes. (E)

All of the Round 1 justification comments agree that the Bobwhite is in trouble.(E)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Various sources indicate NJ population has crashed. 2nd breeding bird atlases for NY and PA indicate 80% and 76% reductions, respectively, in confirmed blocks.(E)

This bird is widely understood to have declined significantly in the state and region. It disappeared as a wild breeder in adjacent Pennsylvania, and NJ populations seem to be likely to disappear soon without active conservation measures.(E)

Large degradation, and largely absent breeding bird where it once was common, now is a rarity. Through conservation management, this bird is a great candidate in restoring to historical populations.(SC)

This species has declined drastically and experienced near extirpation. (SC)

Population in steep decline, suitable habitat is complex and has been lost to development, mechanized ag, and lack of active management. If this continues, the species will eventually be gone. Not certain if the population has already gotten below the threshold for recovery or is suffering from inbreeding depression. If so, I'd be inclined to list it as endangered.(T)

BBS data show big decline. This species can be hard to detect. I request NJ hunting data to better understand what's known about population. Despite frequent stocking still taking place, this species lives quite ephemerally in many NJ sites. This is a difficult situation to interpret, along with concerns of non-locally-native stock. (SC)

Native population possibly extirpated from NJ. Most recent sightings likely released birds. (E)

The native Northern Bobwhite was essentially extirpated from New Jersey and a recovery program has been instituted.(E)

Already gone from most of historic range which was most of the state. Barely hanging on in a few isolated pockets.(E)

The number of Bobwhites on the Breeding bird surveys in their stronghold in south and central NJ has crashed. Some of these routes had 50 to 60 birds per year in the 1960s and 1970s and zero or one per year recently.(T)

This species has declined regionally, but is also limited by lack of early- and mid-successional habitat in the large tract size required to sustain populations. With intensive ag in SW NJ and lacking targeted habitat mgt, it's not likely to recover. (SC)

Northern Bobwhite (*Colinus virginianus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Endangered**

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	13	1	0	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF	6.0	5.0					

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

This species should be listed as endangered as a breeder, and since it's basically non-migratory populations (if restored) should be protected year-round. (E)

Declines are widespread regionally throughout the NE and northern Mid-Atlantic. (E)

Presumably non-migratory species; Breeding and Non-breeding statuses should be the same as threats remain the same all year. (T)

As a species that isn't known as a regular migrant, concerns apply equally to breeding and non-breeding status.(E)

I changed from SC to E because overall population is thought to be so low. This is a very tough one for me to decide on because of re-stocking efforts that have already taken place.(E)

CBC data demonstrates the demise of Northern Bobwhite in NJ. Numbers declined from a maximum of more than 800 in 1975 to zero in 2015.

(E) this species primarily only occurs as a breeding species and is a year round resident where it still occurs. essentially non migratory.(E)

Non-migratory, so same status as breeding should be applied for this species.(E)

I agree with these opinions. Perhaps it's time to really give this species the attention it deserves.(E)

Small, declining, disjunct NJ populations that depend on a habitat type that is uncommon and relatively short-lived (on a successional timeline).

Sensitive to severe winter weather.(E)

NJ Audubon states Bobwhite have been extirpated from the Pinelands since the late 1980s. Wild birds from Georgia have been transplanted to the Pine Island Cranberry property in 2015 and 2016.(E)

Very steep population declines. Based on PIF plan (2016), 83% of population has been lost and we could lose half the existing population in 10 years. Threats to the non-breeding population are moderate, but is a resident species. Will likely become extirpated if this trend continues. (E)

Because they are non-migratory, I think this should be the same as breeding status.(E)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Various sources indicate NJ population has crashed. 2nd breeding bird atlases for NY and PA indicate 80% and 76% reductions, respectively, in confirmed blocks.(E)

This bird is widely understood to have declined significantly in the state and region. It disappeared as a wild breeder in adjacent Pennsylvania, and NJ populations seem to be likely to disappear soon without active conservation measures. As a relatively nonmigratory species, habitat/distribution-level concerns apply equally in the breeding and non-breeding seasons.(E)

This species has declined drastically and experienced near extirpation. (SC)

This is a resident species in NJ and the CBC is showing same trends as BBS - same justification as breeding status(T)

Most birds in New Jersey may be mostly sedentary.(SC)

Resident species. Same concerns outside breeding season. (E)

CBC data demonstrates the demise of Northern Bobwhite in NJ. Numbers declined from a maximum of more than 800 in 1975 to zero in 2015. (E)

this species primarily only occurs as a breeding species and is a year round resident where it still occurs. essentially non migratory(E)

Bobwhites are permanent residents, so non-breeding status should be the same as breeding status.(T)

Harsh winters may continue to limit this species in NJ, in addition to limited opportunities for landscape-scale habitat management. (SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Ruffed Grouse (*Bonasa umbellus*) / Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Threatened

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		5.4					

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

I think it's a very justifiable T status species.(T)

Close to consensus here; T does seem most fitting and stands to serve as a barometer for associated habitats and other animals struggling with same issues affecting RUGR. (T)

Overall decline in population, extirpation from many previous portions of range in central/southern jersey.(T)

Local declines now restrict this species to very few locales in the NW sector of the state. Once much more common and declines likely do to land-use/land-cover change... a species to consider managing for!(T)

population declines and rapid range restriction in state warrants Threatened status at the least.(T)

I used the following to justify my SC rank in Round 1, but am changing to T. Agree with the assessments from Round 2 by others ranking the species T. The dramatic decline in Ruffed Grouse numbers is demonstrated by the NJ Estimated Game Bird Harvest, 1973-2016, where grouse number dropped from a maximum of 65,640 in 1978-79 to just 265 in 2015-2016. CBC numbers likewise declined from 40-50 in the 1970's to three or less in the most recent decade(T)

Dramatic decline, not likely to bounce back.(T)

Majority believes breeding population is threatened. (T)

All comments indicate that it is seriously threatened.(T)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Appears to be extirpated from the central/southern part of NJ, with remaining population limited to northwestern NJ, where deer herbivory, invasive species, forest succession and other factors put the remaining population at risk. (T)

This bird used to be regular all the way down to the Delaware Bay shore and is now restricted to the extreme NW of the state. (T)

Obvious declines and elimination from many areas, but also a tough species to survey. (T)

Very localized breeding range(T)

I could be persuaded to choose T or SC, but I think T is more appropriate because of the severity of the decline in this species in NJ and surrounding regions. Active management for this species in the northern part of NJ could benefit other at-risk species such as Golden-winged Warblers.(T)

We all agree on decline. Population estimates fit for T status.(T)

Ruffed Grouse numbers have declined dramatically in the past forty years. Part of this decline is surely attributable to maturing forests and decline of second-growth habitat availability, but there may be other causes.(T)

mostly extirpated from the state with the exception of it's northern strongholds. Even there it's shown declines and contraction of it's range.(T)

Species depends on uncommon and relatively short-lived habitat type (early successional forest), has a limited NJ range, and has been in decline.(T)

Ruffed Grouse went unreported in eBird for three entire months (Feb., Aug., Oct.) in 2016.(T)

Moderate threats to breeding populations, but population decline is not severe in neighboring states. The range has restricted in NJ, but not enough to warrant E status. Unless more data show extent of population declines in NJ, this species is locally abundant enough to also not warrant T status.(SC)

ebird and the comments from Round 1 show significantly decreasing population.(T)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

eBird data shows state range restricted to Kittatinny Ridge and Valley and northern Highlands only. Large declines noted in 2nd breeding bird atlases in NY (38% fewer confirmed blocks) and PA (53% fewer confirmed blocks).(E)

BBS & CBC data, in conjunction with a perusal of eBird data, show major declines in the species and a big range retraction in NJ (now completely gone from the southern edge of its range).(T)

Has decreased in numbers, should be looked at carefully, through understory deforestation from over population of deer.(T)

This species has declined drastically, and remains only in very localized pockets(SC)

The BBS timing doesn't coincide with RUGR breeding so the population is likely higher than what's shown. That said, the population has declined along with suitable habitat, and the current stronghold for RUGR is in the Delaware Water Gap where there is still a complex of forests and shrubby fields. Without active management, however, the population will continue to decline. (SC)

BBS data show precipitous decline and they have reduced in distribution.(T)

BBS data shows drastic decline from 60s to 80s, and continued steady decline after that. eBird map shows shrinking range in NJ. (T)

Ruffed Grouse numbers have declined dramatically in the past forty years. Part of this decline is surely attributable to maturing forests and decline of second-growth habitat availability, but there may be other causes.(SC)

Essentially extirpated from the Southern portion of the state and rapidly declining in the North where it overbrowsing by deer and habitat loss is a problem. (E)

Reduced range in the state. Not many sightings on e-bird.(N/O)

Ruffed Grouse (*Bonasa umbellus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Threatened**

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		5.4					

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

I think it's a very justifiable T status species. (T)

Close to consensus here; T does seem most fitting and stands to serve as a barometer for associated habitats and other animals struggling with same issues affecting RUGR. (T)

Same reasons as stated above; non-migratory year-round resident.(T)

The weight of voting (T) and non-migratory life history.(T)

Regional declines sharp including recent assessment via both the PA and NY Breeding Bird Atlas(T)

Treat breeding and non-breeding populations the same for this species(T)

Same reasons as Breeding Status, since this species doesn't migrate to any extent.(T)

Dramatic decline, not likely to bounce back.(T)

Because this is a resident species, breeding and non-breeding status should be the same.(T)

Permanent resident.(T)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

As a non-migratory species in serious decline, species deserves year-round protection.(T)

Given declines regionally (NY and PA, specifically) the risk of losing a source population of this species is real.(SC)

Resident species, status as breeding. (T)

Presumed to be mostly non-migratory, so same criteria apply as in breeding season.(T)

We all agree on decline. Population estimates fit for T status.(T)

Same concerns as in the breeding season.(T)

This species shows only limited migration, so we should treat the breeding and non-breeding populations the same.(T)

Species depends on uncommon and relatively short-lived habitat type (early successional forest), has a limited NJ range, and has been in decline.(T)

Year-round resident. Non-breeding status should match breeding status.(T)

Moderate threats to non-breeding populations, but population decline is not severe in neighboring states. but population decline is not severe in neighboring states. The range has restricted in NJ, but not enough to warrant E status. Unless more data show extent of population declines in NJ, this species is locally abundant enough to also not warrant T status.(SC)

NJ Harvest Numbers & CBC numbers (mentioned by one in Round 1) convince me that RUGR is in trouble in NJ.(T)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Clear decline in breeding surveys and CBC data over time; essentially extirpated in southern NJ. A 2nd Breeding Bird Atlas will shed more light on this, but very clear declines evident across the board, even in best habitat in NW New Jersey.(SC)

eBird data shows state range restricted to Kittatinny Ridge and Valley and northern Highlands only. Large declines noted in 2nd breeding bird atlases in NY (38% fewer confirmed blocks) and PA (53% fewer confirmed blocks).(E)

BBS & CBC data, in conjunction with a perusal of eBird data, show major declines in the species and a big range retraction in NJ (now completely gone from the southern edge of its range). This is thought to be a mostly nonmigratory species, so concerns for breeding status are similar to non-breeding.(T)

Have to heavily consider taking a harvest of the population while this species declines.(T)

This species has declined drastically, and remains only in very localized pockets(SC)

This species is a resident in NJ - same justification as breeding status. (SC)

May be mostly sedentary. CBC data show huge decline. Data deficient. (T)

Same concerns as in the breeding season. (T)

The dramatic decline in Ruffed Grouse numbers is demonstrated by the NJ Estimated Game Bird Harvest, 1973-2016, where grouse number dropped from a maximum of 65,640 in 1978-79 to just 265 in 2015-2016. CBC numbers likewise declined from 40-50 in the 1970's to three or less in the most recent decade. (SC)

Limited migration in this species, thus all populations that remain are considered breeding populations.(E)

Same as breeding.(N/O)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Yellow-billed Cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	13	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	5.5			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Data suggests overall decline in population, but still appears to be fairly widespread across the state. May be threatened by habitat succession and pesticide use, however.(S/S)

BBS trend analysis from 2003 - 2013 shows no significant trend (adjusted trend is slightly positive, unadjusted is slightly negative). Looking at the entire dataset back to 1966 shows a non-sig negative trend, suggesting that this trend may have stabilized. Considering typical nest height in the canopy, the reforestation of our hardwood forests would suggest stable or increasing populations, all else being equal. (S/S)

Need more data here; a bird that can be tough to survey. (S/S)

I think stable for now. Note to all-- if we vote this as SC, then many other species would have to follow under same criteria.(S/S)

Uncommon but not in clear decline over the past 20 years.(SC)

Population fluctuations appear closely tied to insect outbreaks. 2nd PA BBA fieldwork 2004-09 was completed during a peak with a 43% increase in total blocks (+26% confirmed blocks)reported over first BBA 1983-1989.(S/S)

Listed in 2016 PIF plan as common bird in steep decline with moderate threats to breeding population. Although BBS trends in NJ and neighboring states are stable, the Appalachian Mtn population is declining - half the population has already been lost and another half could be lost in 21 - 40+ years - the population naturally fluctuates so variability is high. It is a tough call, but still not convinced it should be SC. (S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

The species shows minor declines in BBS but breeds in a broad variety of forested and shrubland habitats that are generally not threatened. (U/U)

Yellow-billed Cuckoo has a stable population in southern NJ, northern NJ they seem to be on a slight decline, though I'm not quite sure of the reasoning, if there is one.(S/S)

BBS trend is stable, breeding habitat is stable, and YBCU detected in northern NJ has increased over the last few years. (S/S)

Although still common, Yellow-billed Cuckoos are steadily declining in NJ and throughout eastern North America (according to BBS data, 59-67% decline over 43 years in e. North America). (SC)

Yellow-billed Cuckoo populations have declined by more than 60% in the northeast over the past 40+ years. Prefers more open and second-growth habitat which is diminishing with maturation of forests and land development. Pesticide use has probably reduced prey availability.(SC)

Yellow-billed Cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.5			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

I think stable for now. Note to all-- if we vote this as SC, then many other species would have to follow under same criteria.(S/S)

Listed in 2016 PIF plan as common bird in steep decline with moderate threats to non-breeding population. Half the global population has already been lost and another half could be lost in 29 years - the population naturally fluctuates so variability is high. It is a tough call, but still not convinced it should be SC.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

The species is a nocturnal, neotropical migrant and does not winter in NJ. In spring and fall migration it uses a wide variety of forested habitats (U/U)

Same concerns for migrants. (SC)

May merit special concern for the same reasons as breeding status. Decline has been widespread in northeast.(S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Black-billed Cuckoo (*Coccyzus erythrophthalmus*) / Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	1	13	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		5.0	5.4				

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

This has always been the scarcer cuckoo species in my experience, and is not an easy bird to find in the breeding season in central and south jersey. Perhaps slightly more common in the northern parts of the state. Could suffer further declines in part to maturation of second-growth habitats which it prefers, pesticide use.(SC)

BBS data shows decline over last 10 years AND period of record. Detectability and relative scarcity make this species difficult to survey and deserves a full species assessment for NJ through a Breeding Bird Atlas or targeted research.(SC)

Upon further review and more reading, SC seems like a reasonable fit here, given the threats and what seems to overall be a low and gradually shrinking pop. here. (SC)

BBS declines suggest SC status for breeding season. I agree with the majority of commenters in this regard.(SC)

Seems like consensus is close on this one(SC)

Breeding populations difficult to track year to year because Black-billed Cuckoo moves around in response to insect outbreaks, but long term trend steadily down for several decades in our area. Probably due to loss of preferred habitat to development and succession.(SC)

Population fluctuates greatly from year to year and place to place based on insect outbreaks. Overall declines as a breeder in the state are reason for concern.(SC)

BBS data and Round 1 comments point to a species so at risk that it needs listing more serious than Special Concern status.(T)

Global population of BBCU is lower than YBCU (890k vs 8.2 million), but higher % of BBCU global population occurs in Appalachian Mtns where population decline is steeper and half the App population will be lost in 11+ years (again, highly variable). (SC)

I agree this is a difficult to monitor species. It is definitely not common, though, and seems to be declining.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

A difficult-to-monitor species, with numbers seemingly up and down on a yearly basis. Tough to peg. (U/U)

Breeding Bird Survey and Partners in Flight indicate decline. 2nd NY and PA breeding bird atlases show very modest increases in number of blocks reported, though a decrease of confirmed blocks since 1980s.(SC)

Significant declines are noted in BBS data.(SC)

This low density species appears to be the more sensitive of the two in NJ. A noticeable decline from personal observation and in BBS data, it should be looked at carefully; though population shifts may be dependent on insect population from year to year. Further changes to preferred habitat of scrub/shrub, first secession forest (farmland to forest) to a more forested area may be associated with the decline.(SC)

Currently species of concern. Populations have from my limited experience, this species seems to be less common than Yellow-billed Cuckoo. (SC)

population is declining as is breeding habitat, but they are still locally abundant. If nothing is done to stabilize the population, however, they will become threatened. The 2016 PIF continental plan lists BBCU on the yellow watch list for population declines and moderate to high threats.

66% of the population has already been lost and if trends continue, half the current population will be lost in about 37 years.(SC)

BBS data show general decline at similar or smaller rate from when the species was listed as SC. Thus, keep status. Compiled NJ occurrence data much worse than Birds of New Jersey Atlas.(SC)

Population trends variable regionally, but declines shown by BBS data in NJ appear even more severe than in Yellow-billed. Black-bill's preferred habitat (second growth fields/edge) probably being lost at a faster rate than Yellow-billed habitat (mature woodland). (SC)

Breeding populations difficult to track year to year because Black-billed Cuckoo moves around in response to insect outbreaks, but long term trend steadily down for several decades in our area.(SC)

Fairly small population and seems to be declining.(SC)

Black-billed Cuckoo (*Coccyzus erythrophthalmus*) / Non-Breeding Status



Consensus Not Reached

Summary of Round 4 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	4	10	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.3	4.6			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

PIF Watch List/ regional risks/ regional declines.(SC)

Breeders in NJ and to the north are of concern, and migrants coming through face the same problems.(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

PIF Yellow Watch List species(SC)

Population has declined significantly throughout the eastern forests. (PIF 2016)(SC)

Difficult to assess NJ status, but based on the data I don't think the northeastern population as a whole is secure, esp. since it's a watch list species in a continental plan. (SC)

2nd NY Atlas showed number holding steady.(S/S)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Regional declines indicate that reduction is not simply restricted to NJ. As with most long-distance migrants, finding where along the life cycle the bird is being impacted is difficult. This species deserves a focused study of its full life-cycle to determine where conservation efforts would be most effective. (SC)

Difficult to assess non-breeding/migratory status in NJ.(U/U)

Regionally declining, PIF Yellow Watch List species(SC)

Seems like consensus is close on this one when it comes to breeding. We should mirror the SC to non-breeding because, at least in our region, declines continue and would impact the migrant metapopulation similarly.(SC)

Breeding areas of highest importance (highest % global population and highest declines) are north of NJ (in Canada) and likely migrate through NJ. Still think we should keep track of migrant population in NJ and impacts of changing forest conditions and urbanization.(SC)
same as breeding - hard to monitor but it is uncommon.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This is a nocturnal neotropical migrant that does not winter in New Jersey. It uses a variety of forest and edge habitats on migration but is not at elevated risk during that period in NJ.(S/S)

Migration is long traveled to CA and SA facing many obstacles. Increased use of insecticides may make the journey harder in southern climates where there has been increased pressure to control certain aspects of the insect population over the past couple of years. I think our main concern would be during its breeding season with BBCU's preferred habitat diminishing. It is however a visible victim to window strikes in more urban environments; something that inflicts a lot of bird species.(S/S)

According to 2016 PIF continental plan, the population is declining throughout eastern forests, and the threats to non-breeding are the same level as threats breeding. (SC)

Rarely seen migrant, late to arrive in spring, protracted departure in fall. Difficult to assess because so infrequently encountered.(S/S)

Not often encountered on migration.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Common Nighthawk (*Chordeiles minor*) / Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Special Concern**

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	13	1	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.4	5.0			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

The Pine Barrens represent this species' last breeding stronghold in the state; formerly bred on rooftops in urban northeast. Leave as special concern.(SC)

This species is currently of special concern and given it is an aerial insect specialist with affinity for disturbed areas, keeping this species in NJ will require management that produces both insects and disturbance...which often runs counter to local and regional practices (i.e. mosquito control and fire suppression) (SC)

SC seems justified given apparent declines in urban areas, and generally localized populations in the Pine Barrens. (SC)

PIF Common Bird in Steep Decline(SC)

I'm willing to adjust my rank downwards to SC for this species since its NJ range is such a tiny fraction of its continental range. (S/S)

Declining but not rare enough for T status.(SC)

Breeding bird results for NJ show long-term downward trend, but species difficult to census.(SC)

Clearly declining as a breeder throughout the Eastern US including New Jersey. Difficult to fully assess population, but apparently still stable in Pine Barrens. (SC)

CONI is a good candidate for conservation efforts(SC)

Likely to become threatened if trends over the past couple of decades continue. (SC)

CONI is listed in PIF 2016 plan as a common bird with steep declines. It is common and widespread throughout breeding range, but not as common and widespread in NJ. EWPW threats include changing forest conditions, tropical deforestation, urbanization, contaminants, and climate change. It is likely CONI experience similar threats, esp. in NJ. (SC)

Most of the Round 1 comments seem to justify my original feeling that SC is the right call.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Partners in Flight shows a 55% population reduction since 1970. 2nd NY and PA breeding bird atlases show even steeper declines of 71% fewer blocks reporting in both states since the 1980s. The NJ stronghold is the Pine Barrens. NJ eBird data from June in the last ten years suggests the species is absent in areas it was documented during the NJ BBA in the 1990s.(T)

Throughout much of its breeding range (including NJ), this species has declined significantly. However, NJ covers just a small fraction of the breeding range for the species, and conservation actions here are unlikely to have population-level implications, hence my low confidence level for this species.(E)

I'm on the edge between stable & SC. This species is a relatively low density breeder in NJ and is sensitive to development. It has been documented in very urban/artificial habitats (cobblestone flat rooftops). I would think in most environments that this ground nester would be susceptible to feral cat predation, and other mammalian predators. Recent (2016) personal observations in the pygmy pines showed good numbers from one vantage point (12 birds) which isn't reflected in some datasets. I think a more concerted effort to comprehend species status and abundance should be warranted in order to more accurately assess population trends. Restricted military properties have large suitable breeding habitats. These properties may hold a much larger population than our current understanding of its status in NJ. Knowing this would potentially influence my decision on it's status in NJ greatly.(SC)

Currently species of special concern. Lack of adequate survey information. Localized populations. (SC)

low population numbers, declining trends, and specific needs for nesting areas warrant a SC status. It is difficult to assign a E or T status due to lack of data - nightjar surveys were done by NJ Audubon a few years ago, but not in areas where CONI would be readily detected. (SC)

Keep as SC. BBS and atlas data show some decline but are both data deficient due to habits vs. detection of species. (SC)

BBS data seem to show a slight decline in NJ, but difficult to assess due to crepuscular habits. eBird data show an apparently strong population persisting in the NJ pine barrens. (U/U)

Breeding bird results for NJ show long-term downward trend, but species difficult to census. Apparently much reduced in cities compared to mid-20th century. This seems to be especially true in northeast, less so in the west.(SC)

declining across its entire range(SC)

All indications are that the numbers are dwindling. (SC)

Common Nighthawk (*Chordeiles minor*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable**

Summary of Round 4 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	2	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	4.8			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Regional decline seems to justify some type of listing.(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Overall decline in the northeast and mid-Atlantic. Not sure exactly what can be for the species in terms of management during migratory periods.(SC)

They are declining throughout the region. 2nd NY atlas showed a 71% decline.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

The species has declined across the US and therefore should remain a species of special concern during passage through NJ.(SC)

PIF Common Bird in Steep Decline(SC)

SC status follows regional declines.(SC)

Species is still common widespread throughout US and most of the breeding population are in central US and don't migrate through NJ. (S/S)

They do migrate through the state and the numbers seem to have declined. They are listed as critically imperiled or imperiled in several nearby states: CT, RI, NH, VT, DE.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species migrates through NJ and does not winter here. It is not presented with any additional threats.(S/S)

Currently species of special concern. Lack of adequate survey information. Localized populations. (SC)

No firm data, but anecdotal and personal experience indicates migrant numbers drastically reduced from 30- 40 years ago.(SC)

I used to see them much more regularly in the fall - they seem much scarcer in the last few years.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Chuck-will's-widow (*Antrostomus carolinensis*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.2			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

PIF Common Bird in Steep Decline (PIF 2016)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Chucks seem to be stable or even increasing as a breeder in coastal woodlands near the marsh interface in Atlantic, Ocean, and Monmouth Counties.(S/S)

The species may be at the north end of its range, but there is potential for expansion with a changing climate, and the species is in decline nationally. Success in S. NJ means the potential for expansion here.(SC)

Regionally declining, and PIF Common Bird in Steep Decline (PIF 2016).(SC)

I think this is borderline between SC and SS. I will currently vote for SS but would urge more careful monitoring of nightbirds in NJ.(S/S)

Being at north end of range doesn't automatically warrant SC, and species is definitely increasing.(S/S)

Twedt et al. 2010 suggest species likely to increase range-wide. Twedt, D. J., Tirpak, J. M., Jones-Farrand, D. T., Thompson, F. R., Uihlein, W. B., & Fitzgerald, J. A. (2010). Change in avian abundance predicted from regional forest inventory data. Forest ecology and management, 260(7), 1241-1250.(S/S)

34% of global CWWI population occurs in Atlantic Coast Joint Venture, including BCR 30. About 68% of ACJV population has already been lost and population still declining in the JV and in the East overall. (SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Species is at north end of its range.(SC)

Substantial declines, though this species is doing better in Southern NJ than E. Whip-poor-will. I suspect that the declines reflected in BBS data (stronger negative BBS trend than Whip-poor-will) do not accurately reflect the status of this species, since BBS is not designed to study nightbird trends and routes are sparse in the part of southern/ coastal NJ occupied by this species.(SC)

I would urge caution in using BBS data for nightjars in general. Most surveys are conducted during early morning hours where crepuscular birds would not necessarily reflect an accurate population & trend. In personal observation of nightjars in Cape May County there has been a noticeable intrusion of CWWI into EWPW historical territories. I would value dedicated nightjar surveys much higher in assessing it's population. Perhaps we could query for such data?(S/S)

population is declining according to BBS and 2016 PIF continental plan, though their range may also be expanding north into NJ.(SC)

Is increasing and spreading. The BBS data is for FWS Eastern Region and doesn't reflect NJ, specifically. (S/S)

BBS data shows an overall decline throughout the East, but questionable whether that dataset adequately monitors a nocturnal species. This species is clearly increasing its range in NJ, and appears to be increasing in population, at least in Cape May County. The moist woodland that they use is probably one of the more stable habitats in the state. (S/S)

Although the breeding bird survey shows a long-term decline in eastern region, Birds of North America suggests caution in interpreting these results. In New Jersey, Chuck-will's Widow is a relatively recent addition to the list of breeding birds, but has continued to expand its range northward during the past five decades.(S/S)

declining due to habitat loss/fragmentation across it's range within the state(SC)

Chuck-will's-widow (*Antrostomus carolinensis*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 4 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	12	1	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	4.7	4.0		

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Very little data/ high uncertainty here.(S/S)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Migration through NJ is relatively unknown.(U/U)

Almost no data on non-breeders in NJ.(U/U)

Species at northern edge of range - not likely a common migrant. (S/S)

I don't think we have enough data on CWWI in NJ during migration.(U/U)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Species is at north end of its range.(SC)

There is almost no data on this species during migration in New Jersey. Migrant detections are quite rare.(U/U)

Another really silent migrant through NJ. I'm not confident in their detection during this time. It's the first of the nightjars of NJ to migrate south, typically in August to mid September, perhaps a time when observation is low. Certainly a bird that could easily fall victim to feral cat predation. Hard to say. (S/S)

Except for small numbers on Long Island, NJ is the northern limit of the breeding range. This species is rarely encountered on migration. It is absent from NJ from October to late April.(S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Eastern Whip-poor-will (*Antrostomus vociferus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	14	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.2				

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

The Pine Barrens seems to be this species last remaining stronghold in the state, and has disappeared from many former deciduous woodlands in central and northern NJ where it once bred. General decline in forest health is a possible cause. (SC)

Clearly a bird in decline locally as well as nationally. Some may be due to competition with CWWI but some may be due to the general plight of aerial insectivores and changing forest health, and additionally exacerbated by poor monitoring protocols. A new Breeding Bird Atlas for NJ should include significant survey protocols to capture actual densities of these nocturnal species of concern.(SC)

Data would benefit from better survey methods; personal observation highly suggests that there has been declines, and this seems mirrored by various datasets and the experience of others. (SC)

Seem to be doing well in the Pine Barrens, but this is a regionally declining species and PIF Yellow Watch List species (PIF 2016)(SC)

I'm willing to go with SC, but I think this will likely merit revisiting soon after a broad-scale nightbird survey effort is undertaken in NJ. I think this bird is in worse shape in NJ than Chuck-will's-widow, especially in the far south.(SC)

It's not rare, but declining and a poster child for mature forest health.(SC)

BBS data is sketchy, but populations are declining, and most of NJ's population is in the Pinelands. (SC)

Range seems to be contracting, but population within that range appears to be stable. Difficult species to properly assess, but still has some population strongholds in New Jersey.(SC)

Need nightjar survey data for the state(SC)

Although BBS data aren't the best kind of data for this crepuscular species, they show a clear and long-term decline that merits special attention.(SC)

The App Mtn region has 10% of global population and already lost 80% of it. Atlantic Coast region has 25% of global population and lost 69% of it. The Piedmont is one of the regions of highest importance for breeding population. According to PIF (2016) threats include changing forest conditions, tropical deforestation, urbanization, contaminants, and climate change.(SC)

It seems to be holding its own in some areas but is declining in others. Competition with CWWI may become a problem if it hasn't already.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Numbers do seem to be down, particularly where competition may exist with Chuck-will's-widow. In other areas, decline perhaps an indicator of declining forest health.(SC)

A comparison of eBird data from the last 10 Junes and NJ Breeding Bird Atlas suggests range is more or less the same.(SC)

This is another species that is poorly represented by BBS data (nocturnal species, not the target of BBS). Regionally, this species is declining substantially, and the recent trend in southern NJ is that many places that used to have breeding E. Whip-poor-will now have none or are occupied solely by Chuck-will's-widow now.(T)

Again, with nightjars, I would urge caution is using available datasets to assess its population and trend. Without dedicated nightjar survey data, it's hard to draw any conclusions.(S/S)

Whip-poor-will populations have declined, but are strong in certain areas (e.g. Pinelands). PIF Watch List species. (SC)

BBS data is sketchy, but populations are declining, and most of NJ's population is in the Pinelands. NJ Audubon conducted surveys for WPWI. According to 2016 PIF Continental Plan, threats to breeding population is moderately high and is on the yellow watch list for decline. If habitat is not managed for breeding habitat, however, this species may become threatened. (SC)

BBS data show general decline. Range shrinkage is also at play. Could deserve T but data deficient as well. NJ Occurrence Map lacks much of the atlas data. (T)

BBS data show a steady decline in NJ, but questionable whether that dataset adequately monitors a nocturnal species. eBird data seems to show a solid decline, based on lower high counts and fewer locations in recent years. The open dry woods and second growth woods that they prefer is probably being lost at a higher rate than the wet woods preferred by Chuck-will's-widow. (SC)

Breeding bird survey shows long-term decline in NJ, but surveys carried out in early morning, not best for detecting Whip-poor-wills. Appears to be displaced to some extent when Chuck-will's Widows move in.(SC)

Published information seems to indicate that they are still declining.(SC)

Eastern Whip-poor-will (*Antrostomus vociferus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Not Reached**

Summary of Round 4 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	3	2	9	0	0
Avg. CONF			6.0	4.5	4.7		

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Data deficient.(U/U)

Extremely difficult to detect as a migrant, but over-abundant deer herbivory and general habitat loss should warrant SC status in migration as well as breeding times.(SC)

I am tempted to change from U to SC because of regional declines, but the data is not clear enough.(U/U)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Information is still lacking but it is tied to come to consensus and SC was chosen to conform with NJ breeding status and also regional declines to the north. (SC)

PIF Yellow Watch List species (PIF 2016)(SC)

Migratory habitat worthy of protection.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Migratory habitat that may be used by Eastern Whip-poor-wills is worthy of protection in addition to breeding habitats, and there is likely some overlap of the two.(SC)

being a silent passage migrant, the non-breeding population of this species is very difficult to quantify in NJ.(U/U)

Very little data available on non-breeders in NJ.(U/U)

It's not rare, but declining and a poster child for mature forest health.(SC)

NJ not likely an important for this species during migration, esp. since most of global population breeds south of NJ. (S/S)

Like CWWI, I don't think we have enough migration data for EWPW.(U/U)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

There is very little data on migrant records of this species in NJ. The species does not winter here.(U/U)

According to 2016 PIF Continental Plan, threats to non-breeding population is moderately high which is the same level as breeding population threats. (SC)

Although much of the breeding range of Whip-poor Will lies north of New Jersey, the species is almost never encountered in migration because of their nocturnal habits and cryptic coloration.(U/U)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Chimney Swift (*Chaetura pelagica*) / Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Special Concern**

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	11	2	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	5.0			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

If habitat reduction is not a reason for decline then that bolsters the case for SC. (SC)

Protecting and advocating roost sites can help this species.(SC)

Can be persuaded to change my vote to SC due to data presented on macro-level declines; apparent that more work is needed on this species. (SC)

PIF Common Bird in Steep Decline (PIF 2016)(SC)

Risk of further population decline in NJ due to loss of nesting sites coupled with overall national decline.(SC)

Declining along with various other aerial insectivores. A species of concern.(SC)

2nd NY and PA BBAs show the number of confirmed blocks decreased by 9% and 55%, respectively, since the 1980's.(SC)

Agree with this assessment by another participant: Species is at risk due to serious risk from loss of suitable nesting sites, reduction of food availability from pesticide use, and overall population decline.(SC)

Declining for a variety of reasons, we should keep an eye on this species.(SC)

The species is still abundant but in serious decline with high threats to the breeding population(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Species is at risk due to serious risk from loss of suitable nesting sites, reduction of food availability from pesticide use, and overall population decline.(SC)

Declines are apparent, PIF lists them as a Common Bird in Steep Decline, and chimney availability does not seem to be the straightforward cause. Aerial insect availability or contamination may play a part. Worth further investigation.(SC)

Regionally declining, and PIF Common Bird in Steep Decline.(SC)

Broad declines suggest that this should be a SC species, even though still relatively common at this point.(SC)

67% of global population has already been lost, we could lose half the existing population in 27 years, and the breeding population faces high threats. 16% of population in App Mtn region (lost 57% with 37-yr half life) 28% in Atlantic Coast (lost 61% with 28-yr half life). Threats breeding probably include climate change in addition to loss of habitat - severe summer droughts can reduce abundance or small aerial insects. (SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Long-term declines in BBS data suggest that this species is in at least slight trouble overall. A declining number of suitable chimneys for nesting could be part of the problem.(SC)

PIF Common Bird in Steep Decline. Populations have declined. (SC)

BBS decline is not on an order that I would think it prudent to be concerned about.(S/S)

Though still common, BBS data show that this species is steadily declining throughout its range, including in NJ. Loss of suitable chimney habitat is apparently not the reason for decline. (SC)

Breeding bird data show a steady, long-term decline in NJ population. Cause could be due to reduced insect populations due to pesticide usage or to decreasing availability of nest sites (although this has not been supported by studies cited in Birds of North America).(SC)

Chimney Swift (*Chaetura pelagica*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable**

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	2	11	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			7.0	4.7			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Makes sense, for a number of reasons, to have non breeding follow suit from breeding. (SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Measures should be taken to ensure that roosting sites for post-breeding and/or migratory flocks are protected.(SC)

Passage migrants require available aerial insect food source as well as similar habitat to breeders. Species in steep decline (PIF).(SC)

Since habitat use is very similar in migration to breeding season and the birds use chimneys in the US throughout the time they are here (April-October, roughly), the ranking ought to be the same as breeding season.(SC)

Non-breeding population faces moderate threats. If many individuals migrate through NJ, we should consider SC for migrants. (SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Migrants use the same roosting substrates as breeding birds (primarily chimneys) so the ranking should be similar to breeding season. Many migrants pass through NJ in spring and fall.

PIF Common Bird in Steep Decline. Populations have declined. (SC)

Unknown whether declines are due to problems on the breeding grounds, winter grounds, or migration. It may be worth monitoring important stopover roost sites used by migrants. (SC)

Common migrants, but most gone by end of September, returning late April.(S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Killdeer (*Charadrius vociferus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	13	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.3			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Slight declines in NJ can be offset against a huge population across North America. Relative to other species, Killdeer are doing OK in New Jersey.(S/S)

Not imperiled in NJ for a while. I hope all species rarer than this species were considered for inclusion!(S/S)

Killdeer (*Charadrius vociferus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	11	1	1	0
Avg. CONF				5.7	4.0		

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Little data on migrants, but peak numbers are found during migration, especially fall migration in August - October. Trends are not concerning. (S/S)

Still very common, and generally stable in North America, but declining in NJ, where open habitat is disappearing quickly. (U/U)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Upland Sandpiper (*Bartramia longicauda*) / Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Endangered

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	13	1	0	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF	6.7	6.0					

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

With only two breeding sites remaining (AC airport, Lakehurst) and probably less than 15-20 pairs), this is an obvious ranking of E.(E)

Only breeding in a few sites currently, but historically more widespread. Grassland management has been shown to be effective in attracting and supporting this species and other early successional habitat obligates.(E)

Essentially gone as a breeding bird. (E)

I think this is a slam-dunk for endangered status in the state, highlighting the importance of the few appropriate large grassland sites that are left. (E)

I originally picked T from a sort of artificial bubble of a definition for E and T criteria. It fits the technical definition for E but so do most of NJ's local grassland species. Do we want to bring grasslands to such a forefront and priority for conservation in NJ at this point?? I would like to see all other imperiled native habitats prioritized over grasslands for NJ because that is the nativity of the region. I read the comments for E, and I agree but still want to talk about T status for this and other grassland species. (T)

As others have noted, a few UPSA holdouts limited to human-constructed, low intensity grasslands. Highly unlikely this species can ever "recover" in NJ. (E)

Already considered endangered in NJ. Steady decline in breeding bird numbers. Now reduced to only a couple of sites in the state. Available habitat is largely a human construct in the state and therefore ephemeral.(E)

Breeds at only a few remaining locations in the state and all of those are intensively managed. Certainly it's status as a New Jersey breeding species has not improved at all.(E)

One of their hotspots- Lakehurst is currently installing a large commercial solar ground mount. May be detrimental depending on where it's constructed. http://www.nj.com/burlington/index.ssf/2016/12/solar_project_at_nj_military_base_largest_in_north.html(E)

Depends on a variety of co-located habitats, some of which (grassland) are rare in the state.(E)

This status assessment should be based on facts and science, not involve subjective reasoning or opinions about which habitat type should be prioritized. E - Endangered: Applies to a species whose prospects for survival within the state are in immediate danger due to one or several factors, such as loss or degradation of habitat, overexploitation, predation, competition, disease or environmental pollution, etc. An endangered species likely requires immediate action to avoid extinction within NJ. Based on the data, UPSA requires action to avoid extirpation, even if that action is to maintain suitable habitat at airports.(E)

The breeding population is so small as to be critically endangered. A few poor breeding seasons and this species could become extirpated as breeding bird.(E)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Breeding confined to just a few sites (Lakehurst, Atlantic City Airport). Extremely vulnerable. Large decline on a regional level. Should be maintained at E. (E)

Presumably Lakehurst is still the one remaining nesting site?(E)

This species is almost gone from the state as a breeding bird, mostly restricted to the Lakehurst/ Fort Dix area now.(E)

I think that this bird deserves a threatened status. With the degradation of it's grassland habitat, this species has diminished to the point where we need special attention to preserve the population that's left, and make strides to expand available habitat. Where the species once occurred as a breeder the habitat has changed and they no longer occur. The similarities of preferred habitat with CONI superficially, in-state military facilities may be the stronghold of this species. UPSA holds a very stoic, accomplished species in my mind, only occurring in the most pristine grasslands of NJ, where other dependent grassland species will be found; something that is a rarity in the state.(T)

Steep declines. Only persist on airports. (E)

There are about 5 known active breeding locations for UPSA in NJ and most of the landowners could easily change management practices so the habitat is no longer suitable. (E)

I support downlist from E to T. Population supports E status but this is not the only important factor at play as this is a very-open grasslands obligate breeder. NJ contains breeders of this species in the set (and mostly actively-managed) appropriate grassland locations in the state.

This logic influences upgrading so that species in ecosystems that need more help are prioritized. (T)

Virtually extirpated as a breeder in NJ. (E)

Already considered endangered in NJ. Steady decline in breeding bird numbers. Now reduced to only a couple of sites in the state. Available habitat is largely a human construct in the state and therefore ephemeral.(E)

Only hanging on a few heavily managed sites, in serious risk of disappearing from the state as a breeding species.(E)

Habitat for this species is dwindling and hard to conserve.(E)

UPSA is truly limited in NJ to airports and other sites managed for large areas of grassland. In NJ and most eastern states, the age of low intensive agriculture that favored grassland birds is over.(E)

Upland Sandpiper (*Bartramia longicauda*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Not Reached

Summary of Round 4 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	11	0	3	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF	5.1		5.3				

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Non-breeding status should probably follow breeding since habitat is so similar AND this is an E species.(E)

Requires some attention, but unsure how much impact can be made.(SC)

Support during migration with preferred habitat support through the state can help UPSA along with many other transient birds that could use the shelter/food resources.(E)

I support keeping all populations as endangered. Stopover habitat for migrants is very limited.(E)

Comes through NJ but depends on rare and shrinking habitat.(E)

Seriously threatened throughout its range; even stopover habitat protection could help(E)

Protect migratory habitat for this species wherever it may still exist in NJ.(E)

very limited habitat; loss of that means no suitable stopover for this species.(E)

The non-breeding population is currently listed as E. The eastern population is in severe decline and is known to use staging areas in NJ, esp during fall migration. Data do not suggest downlisting to T or SC is warranted(E)

Habitat is in danger and the numbers are too low for anything other than E.(E)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Migrants passing through will be aided by proper habitat, perhaps incentives to sod farmers to plant sod during the right time of year will help. (E)

Changing my vote to SC, as overall statewide status as migrant a bit unclear, as is our role/ability to maintain stopover habitat. (SC)

Worth protecting migratory stopover sites for this imperiled breeder.(E)

Habitat is limited and emphasis on grassland creation and management has waned in recent years with lack of funding. (E)

Still a regular migrant through the state alas in small numbers. Not as particular about stopover habitat as it is with breeding habitat and most probably flyover the state without even landing if weather permits.(SC)

Suitable staging areas for UPSA in NJ are limited.(SC)

Comes through NJ but depends on rare and shrinking habitat.(E)

The non-breeding population is currently listed as E. The eastern population is in severe decline and is known to use staging areas in NJ, esp during fall migration. Data do not suggest downlisting to T or SC is warranted. (E)(E)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

A scarce migrant, this species is typically encountered in very small numbers during southbound migration, largely at sod farms. (E)

Given the regularity of passage through NJ, especially when nocturnal calls are analyzed, suggests we should be concerned with maintaining habitat for them during migration.(E)

Lack of habitat alone suggests E status(E)

Stopover habitat is similar/ same as breeding habitat so rank should be the same. Not sure that "near-daily migrant over Cape May during mid-Jul to late-Aug" is an accurate characterization, though.(E)

I originally picked T from a sort of artificial bubble of a definition for E and T criteria. It fits the technical definition for E but so do most of NJ's local grassland species. Do we want to bring grasslands to such a forefront and priority for conservation in NJ at this point?? I would like to see all other imperiled native habitats prioritized over grasslands for NJ because that is the nativity of the region. I read the comments for E, and I agree but still want to talk about T status for this and other grassland species. (T)

Very small numbers continue to pass through NJ, but depend on sod farms and other open short-grass habitats, which are increasingly scarce in the state.(SC)

Uncommon long distant migrant, and can be difficult to detect. I suspect the majority pass right over New Jersey without stopping unless inclement weather forces them to stop.(SC)

Migrates through the state but is endangered overall, so deserves attention during non-breeding season in NJ.(SC)

The non-breeding population is currently listed as E. The eastern population is in severe decline and is known to use staging areas in NJ, esp during fall migration. Data do not suggest downlisting to T or SC is warranted. (E)

There doesn't seem to be any way to preserve enough grasslands for them to have sufficient stopover points.(E)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

A near-daily migrant over Cape May during mid-Jul to late-Aug, so obviously is utilizing habitat in the region during southbound (and likely less so northbound) migration.(E)

Not many reported annually in eBird.(E)

This species is not easily detected during migration, but there is evidence of declines during this season, perhaps linked to lack of suitable stopover habitat. Many fall migrants are probably birds coming south/ east from the boreal forest/ taiga of northern North America (primarily July-August) rather than local breeders, and many of the individuals detected are found on airfields or as flyovers in Cape May.(SC)

Steep declines. (E)

Suitable staging areas for UPSA in NJ are limited. (SC)

BBS data show regional decline. Support for stop-over habitat may be required. (SC)

Very small numbers continue to pass through NJ, but depend on sod farms and other open short-grass habitats, which are increasingly scarce in the state. (SC)

Very uncommon as a migrant, especially in spring. Numbers have never recovered from market hunting of previous centuries.(E) declining regionally(SC)

Not many recent sightings posted on ebird.(E)

They are limited during migration to relatively few sites (esp. large, managed airports), with little hope of the large-scale grassland management in NJ.(E)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

American Woodcock (*Scolopax minor*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	2	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	5.2			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

This species is still fairly numerous at specific places during spring where second-growth habitat is extensive (Sandy Hook, Great Swamp, smaller parcels of protected grasslands in central NJ), but habitat fragmentation and maturation of old fields and second-growth could contribute to a further decline. Worth watching.(SC)

Substantial declines but still common. This is the time to rank this as SC, while it's still common but problematic declines have become apparent.(SC)

NY and PA 2nd BBAs indicate continued widespread distributions since 1980's with little change in overall blocks reporting. However, there were much fewer confirmed blocks (-49% and -33%, respectively).(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Though this has been estimated to be one of the most common shorebirds in North America (Birder's Conservation Handbook, J. Wells), declines during the breeding season are substantial as shown in the 1968-2015 singing-ground survey, but the species is still widespread across the state. Appropriate habitat is largely fragmented in NJ.(SC)

Regional declines are not yet a big problem. (S/S)

Very different trend lines looking at BBS data vs CBC data. Neither one is likely to sample this species well without rigorous crepuscular sampling. The woodcock singing ground survey is likely a more reliable indicator of population trends, and shows a decline in the east.

Reduction in second growth habitat in NJ could be a problem for woodcocks. (SC)

Singing ground survey shows gradual decline over multiple decades. This may be largely due to loss of suitable habitat as second-growth forests mature.(SC)

The number of displaying males in the Great Swamp doesn't seem to have changed in more than 20 years. They are still common in the spring.(S/S)

American Woodcock (*Scolopax minor*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	10	1	1	0
Avg. CONF				5.3	4.0		

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

CBC trends are increasing for this species; it is clear that a substantial wintering population exists in NJ (indeed, this is part of the justification for preserving such properties as Higbee Beach WMA) and continued, careful monitoring of this reclusive species is warranted here.(S/S)

Temperature may be the biggest factor for CBC numbers. (S/S)

The decline in hunting harvest seems to be primarily due to a decline in hunter interest. CBC data have held steady for decades, although numbers are not high.(S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*) / Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	6.0			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

It is definitely time to bring Osprey to S/S. They are prospering in the state, have plenty of nesting areas, and are continuously monitored by volunteers and employees. This means that we are already seemingly diligent on the status of the species and so it wouldn't be a problem to bring it back to status in the future if it declined again.(S/S)

A population that needs to be monitored to ensure it continues to be stable should be listed as special concern until we know it can hold its own without human intervention.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

There's hardly an empty nesting platform anywhere I visit in coastal NJ; the species is also nesting on almost any cell phone or other high tower within site of a water body. Seems stable or increasing. May be susceptible to poor nesting years, though, due to extreme weather and lack of sufficient food (Menhaden) in the early part of the breeding cycle. (S/S)

The NJ osprey population appears stable and secure at this point. Protection of nearshore fisheries is critical to sustaining these birds, though, and careful attention must be paid to future changes in population. (S/S)

T to SC is more conservative than T to S/S. It is probably back for good, but as an apex predator with a well-kknown state popuation I think it should still be monitored for the time being.(SC)

This species has recovered well. Future monitoring remains important because it is one of the best indicators of fishery health (esp. menhaden, on which the NJ coastal pop relies). (S/S)

I think at this point their numbers are doing very well in NJ(S/S)

The population is increasing, but it is still not known if the breeding population will decline if active management ceases. Until that is known it should be special concern. (SC)

The species is stable in NJ but its population should continue to be monitored.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Breeding numbers now back to pre-DDT levels, but issues related to sea level rise and climate change cannot be ignored. (SC)

BBS and ENSP data indicate significant increase. 2nd NY and PA breeding bird atlases show 147% and 89% increase in reporting blocks since 1980s.(SC)

This species is doing extremely well in NJ, especially in the coastal marshes. The recovery has been a huge success and this species does not need additional help in the state at this point.(S/S)

Currently listed as Threatened. Breeding populations are doing well in certain areas, but I'm not sure this is enough to warrant a downlisting. (T)

Population is increasing, but there are still some threats to the breeding population in terms of contaminants and nest disturbance. (S/S)

I will read NJ Osprey report. I will probably continue to support downlist to SC because of fast increase to population. (SC)

Incre

With ever increasing numbers of breeding Ospreys in the state, I think it is time to remove it from Threatened status. Should continue to monitor for protection of nesting sites.(SC)

The numbers continue to climb, but they are susceptible to environmental factors in the marine environment. The number of Ospreys on the Ocean City breeding bird census is consistently among the highest in the country.(SC)

The OSPR population in NJ, at approx. 600 nesting pairs, is close to (and possibly higher than) the pre-DDT population. Although trees were largely removed from barrier islands, ospreys have benefitted from the very widespread nest platform installations coast-wide. Stability for this restored population, however, will depend on the maintenance of nest platforms well into the future. Despite their success, they are particularly vulnerable to declines in ocean fish stocks, especially menhaden, for which there's a significant commercial fishery in all the eastern states. (S/S)

Osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*) / Non-Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	12	0	1	0
Avg. CONF				6.6			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Stable and rising numbers of migrants being recorded, but as in breeding status, needs to be monitored closely.(S/S)

A common migrant, especially along the coasts. (S/S)

Increasing. (S/S)

Very common migrant spring and fall. Not seen every year on CBC's and then only one or a few. Does not winter in NJ.(S/S)

Numbers at the Cape May Hawk Watch seem to be stable.(S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Mississippi Kite (*Ictinia mississippiensis*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Not Reached

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	3	0	0	11
Avg. CONF				4.3			5.5

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

We are on the fringe of this expanding species' range, and this is not the type of species to address here.(S/S)

This is a N/A that could soon change into regular breeding, which would then be either SC or S/S. But not yet a regular/annual breeder. (N/A)

With only a single breeding record, not sufficient evidence to support decision on status.(N/A)

First breeding record means too soon to tell if it's even a viable breeder...more time needed to see what transpires.(N/A)

It's not yet established as a regular breeding species.(N/A)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

I would personally love to see the bird colonize New Jersey, but at the moment it is to ephemeral and new to receive status, plus we should always prioritize birds with the longest breeding recorded in the state.(S/S)

Sticking with SC, this recent breeder requires attention and protection.(SC)

not enough information with only a single breeding pair; recent colonist. (N/A)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

A new nesting species to NJ, we're still an outlier of the core breeding population. Relatively tolerant of humans (often nests in large shade trees in towns in other portions of its range), it will be interesting to see if NJ becomes a stable portion of its nesting range. If so, we could revisit its status.(N/A)

Since the species has only just begun to breed in the state (and any future breeding is unknown) this species is of least concern regarding breeding but would benefit from monitoring to determine whether a range expansion occurs. (U/U)

Peripheral species just starting to nest here. Not deserving of elevated rank in NJ.(S/S)

I still think it doesn't warrant too much attention at the moment.(S/S)

With confirmed breeding in NJ, MIKI needs some protection to ensure their success.(SC)

Population is increasing and range is expanding - this species is not in danger of becoming threatened at this time. (S/S)

It's such a peripheral breeding species that I am not sure it can be ascribed a status other than NA.(N/A)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

First documented nest in NJ (Waretown) in 2016.(U/U)

Peripheral species. The species is expanding its range to the north (recent breeding events in NY, CT, NH, and of course, NJ in 2016. There is no reason that this should be treated as a species of concern here.(S/S)

2016 represents the first confirmation of this species breeding in Waretown, NJ. This southern species will be occurring more, adults/subadults being witnessed at spring migration sites in larger numbers year to year. Virginia to our south had their first breeding record in 1997, where on this past year's breeding bird atlas, they confirmed two nests. Raising concern for this species will be awareness & social protection from wildlife observers. Personal observations of this species include a very high number (15) in Belleplain State Forest during the summer of 2013. Long staying birds fed upon the 17 year cicada in huge abundance there during the time.(SC)

It now fits the definition of E. Recent colonizer which may prove to be ephemeral, but colonization follows a recent regional trend. For now I think it should just be afforded MBTA and nesting raptor protections. (S/S)

First breeding record was this year, so I don't consider New Jersey to be an important breeding area for the species. (N/A)

Mississippi Kite nested in New Jersey in 2016 for the first time after years of anticipation by birders. As this species continues to expand its range north, additional nesting can be anticipated. The kites are relatively tolerant of human activity and presence near nests, but potential for disturbance exists.(SC)

NJ is at the very periphery of this species range.(N/A)

Mississippi Kite (*Ictinia mississippiensis*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable**

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	12	0	0	2
Avg. CONF				6.4			5.0

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

It has become more common as a migrant.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Very few migrants, mostly overshoots.(U/U)

Peripheral species. Uncommon spring overshoot and very rare fall migrant. (S/S)

Increasing as a nonbreeding visitor. (S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Bald Eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) / Breeding Status



Consensus Not Reached

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	10	4	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		5.3	5.5				

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

While I think that T overestimates the protections required for this species in the state, I'm persuaded to up/ downgrade this by one step for reasons mentioned by others.(T)

Numbers continue upward swing, but issues from disturbance and poisoning?(SC)

I think at this point downgrading from E to T would be appropriate.(T)

They don't seem to require habitat management for their population to be sustained. Which makes the case for a stable population increasing on its own. (SC)

Downgrade to Threatened at the very least. They are increasing population and close to nesting saturation in the state. Next assessment will probably warrant delisting entirely if trends continue.(T)

Shouldn't be downlisting two steps to SC without a longer set of data.(T)

Willing to change vote from SC to T to help reach consensus, but downgrading concern to SC may not be too many years from now.(T)

With 150 breeding pairs, it's hard to consider this species at great risk anymore, compared to other birds we're reviewing. Some protective status is certainly warranted, but I agree w/ others who have said we may be near the "saturation point" for this species in NJ. Though I will reiterate my previous concern about what "SC" status really does--in light of several examples where night-heron roosts were destroyed or fields mown where SC grassland species were nesting.(SC)

The species is still very vulnerable to disturbance and requires habitat protection for nesting. Recent de-listing should be followed in NJ, but with appropriate caution.(T)

I think NJ's bald eagle population is close to being recovered. Additional monitoring is needed so it should still be listed. (SC)

This could be SC but I agree with the comments about an incremental move.(T)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

I appreciate the arguments for T, but consider that the population continues to climb and we may be approaching some sort of carrying capacity for optimal nesting sites and territories already(T)

Major progress has been made, recommend downgrading from E to T(T)

Incremental change probably not a bad thing here, given some poisoning issues that remain/have re-emerged. T(SC)

Following the federal move, remove from state endangered species list. Protections must still be afforded to prevent disturbance to nest which is known to cause abandonment.(T)

I second a step-wise upgrade to (T).(T)

Downgrade (Upgrade?) status to Threatened. Doing very well and probably close to saturation as a breeder. Prefer to downgrade step by step just to be on the safe side.(T)

Same comment as last Round. With more than 150 active nests in the state and the breeding population approaching saturation in many areas, surely it is time to remove Bald Eagle from the Endangered Species list.(SC)

Not enough time to jump all the way down to SC, need more time to monitor. The next new pesticide could turn the recovery right around.(T)

I think NJ's bald eagle population is close to being recovered. Additional monitoring is needed so it should still be listed. (SC)

Breeding outlook seems bright but I think it should continue to be monitored. Based on the Round 1 and 2 comments (and the fact that the breeding locations need significant protection) I am changing from SC to T.(T)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Population seems to be ever-increasing, with nests in all but one NJ county. (S/S)

Given the success of the species post DDE-ban, we should move it from E to T. Given their sensitivity during nesting they still warrant protection. (T)

Increasing populations support down-listing from E to T.(T)

I'd be open to ranking this as SC after a successful recovery, but ranking it higher seems unnecessary. There are a lot of declining species being ignored at the SS/ SC borderline for ranking while we debate whether increasing Bald Eagles should still be considered state endangered.(SC)

Just like with Osprey I think a step-wise movement is appropriate, E to T in this case.(T)

The NJ population is 150-160 nesting pairs with nest success usually >75%. There is federal protection for nests that is pretty minimal (330' to 660') and doesn't consider many types of disturbances that can ruin a nesting season. Communal roosts are an important element to maintain eagles (esp younger eagle survival) but are not currently well known. (T)

With more than 150 active nests in the state and the breeding population approaching saturation in many areas, surely it is time to remove Bald Eagle from the Endangered Species list(SC)

BAEA still needs to be closely monitored.(T)

Now nesting throughout the state but not likely to ever be common. National trend is up. But probably still needs to be considered threatened until number of breeding pairs remains steady for several years.(T)

The population is increasing, but it is still not known if the breeding population will decline if active management ceases. Until that is known it should be special concern. (SC)

If there are a few more good breeding years or if the number of active nests climbs over 200 I think it should be changed to S. For now, i would vote for SC. It still needs to be actively monitored.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Over 150 pairs. Nests in nearly every county. No longer Federally listed. Should be upgraded to threatened.(T)

This could get a SC ranking, but the species has increased/ recovered to a pretty strong point. (S/S)

Currently endangered. Although populations are doing well, I'm not sure there's enough evidence to downlist. (E)

population is increasing but the population size is still small throughout the region and there are still a number of threats to the breeding population.(SC)

I will read the NJ BAEA report. Recent increases in all data. I support downlisting from E to T.(T)

With more than 150 active nests in the state and the breeding population approaching saturation in many areas, surely it is time to remove Bald Eagle from the Endangered Species list.(T)

The increase in number of nest sites has been phenomenal. However, they are so susceptible to human disturbance and environmental factors, that the population still needs to be very closely monitored.(SC)

The NJ eagle population is between 150 and 160 nesting pairs, of which about ___% are successful in fledging young. The historic population level is unknown because prior to the DDT decline, there had been decades of persecution of eagles and other raptors. Bald eagles remain sensitive to disturbance that can disrupt nesting, and to habitat loss particularly in all habitats adjacent to water. Federal law (the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act) provides minimal buffer protections around nests and around identified communal roosts. Roosts are not well defined in NJ at this time.(SC)

Bald Eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			7.0	5.8			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

NJ and especially south Jersey habitats are important to the mid-Atlantic population in the non-breeding season. Influx of eagles from SE US in late summer, and from NE US for winter, make me recommend SC status in NB season. (SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Just to follow with the NJ breeders, of which many seem to stay on territory most of the year.(T)

NJ is important to the larger mid-Atlantic population in winter, which consists of post-fledging birds from southeast US and migrants from NE/Canadian nesting areas. This highlights the importance of identifying and protecting good foraging and winter roosting habitat to accommodate a sustainable pop. (SC)

Even during the non-breeding season (September-December), it is not unusual to see local birds on territory and occasional work on their nest or alternate nest.(T)

The population is increasing and non-breeding eagles do not need active management/protection from disturbance. (S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Should stay threatened in recognition of winter concentrations and that most of the breeding population likely does not migrate.(T)

Migrant numbers continue to increase in the state (Cape May hawkwatch data).(S/S)

Currently threatened (non-breeding). Although populations are doing well, I'm not sure there's enough evidence to downlist. (T)

I support changing status from T to SC. Population and location increases from CBC and eBird data. (SC)

Common wintering bird. The CBC graph is useless because of erroneous data input for 1950. In fact, the number of Bald Eagles seen on CBC's has increased steadily from as few as 18 in 1986 to 569 in 2015.(S/S)

They are much more commonly encountered than they were a decade or two ago.(SC)

Eagles nesting in NJ are year-round residents, and generally remain in their nest territories all year, so the non-breeding population is, to a large degree, the breeding population. They cannot be separated, but the population in the non-breeding season (Aug-Dec) includes sub-adult eagles that rely on good roosting habitat they usually use communally with other eagles. These roosts are usually located within several miles of foraging areas that are just as essential to sustain eagles through the winter and early spring.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Northern Harrier (*Circus cyaneus*) / Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Endangered**

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	13	1	0	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF	6.8	4.0					

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Steady long-term decline in breeding population in NJ, coupled with sea level rise and marsh degradation.(E)

This species has disappeared as a breeder almost entirely. Whether they can be brought back with serious habitat management remains to be seen, but they may be the canary in the coal mine for our high marsh habitat being lost to SLR, subsidence and invasion by non-native species. (E)

Again, major issues here with sea level rise; see results from breeding survey in 2010:

<http://www.njaudubon.org/portals/10/research/pdf/njrb3.11r.pdf> . Species perhaps in danger of being extirpated as breeding bird in next 10-20 years(E)

Loss of marsh habitat, further threatened by sea level rise.(E)

Despite strong declines in NJ, this is really a peripheral species here - the main bulk of the population is far to the north and west of the state.

Still, it should deserve at least a threatened rank here.(T)

Declines and very low pop-- fit E criteria(E)

Never common as a breeding bird, but number of nesting pairs has dropped to near zero. (E)

Continues to dramatically decline in the state. Very localized breeder and now gone or mostly gone from many of it's former strongholds.(E)

Agree with panelists' opinions.(E)

Very rare and dependent on habitat that continues to disappear. Can't justify removing from endangered list.(E)

A ground-nesting raptor that is already declining in the East and dependent upon grasslands and high marsh for nesting in a state where urbanization, changes in agricultural practices, and sea-level rise threaten already limited nesting habitat is in danger of being extirpated without immediate action.(E)

The population has continued to decline and it may be heading the way of the Short-eared Owl, another raptor that used to share the same habitat in NJ.(E)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Major issues here with sea level rise; see results from breeding survey in 2010: <http://www.njaudubon.org/portals/10/research/pdf/njrb3.11r.pdf> . Species perhaps in danger of being extirpated as breeding bird in next 10-20 years.(E)
It seems the Delaware Bayshore is the last remaining breeding stronghold in NJ.(E)
This species has disappeared from almost all of its former breeding areas (with Delaware Bay as a former stronghold). However, given the huge population of this species across North America (with NJ playing a very small role in the breeding range), I don't think it's necessary to list this as Endangered here (though I could be convinced that Endangered is warranted given that the species is almost extirpated here in NJ as a breeder).(T)
Degradation of marshland habitat, tropical systems crashing available food sources- I'm wavering on either side of S and SC(S/S)
Currently endangered. Breeding status not well known and localized. (E)
Population is still in decline, it has a small population size, specific habitat requirements, and there are many threats to the breeding population. (E)
Lost from more areas even in last 20 years. I interpret BBS, atlas, and eBird data to show that there's less than 50 breeding pairs in NJ. (E)
BBS data show a very slow decrease in the East. In NJ, harriers nest mainly in tidal saltmarsh, which is severely threatened by sea level rise. Interior grasslands suitable for nesting harriers are also a scarce commodity. (T)
Never common as a breeding bird, but number of nesting pairs has dropped to near zero. (E)
currently breeding in only a few locations. Steady decline. Seriously threatened by habitat loss and degradation.(E)
The numbers have declined dramatically. They used to be somewhat common at the Great Swamp, but I haven't seen one there during the breeding season in many years. The area of appropriate habitat has declined.(E)
This species has been hard hit by the loss of high marsh on both Atlantic and Delaware Bay coasts. Only substantial, targeted marsh management has any chance of bringing this species back.(E)

Northern Harrier (*Circus cyaneus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Special Concern**

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	13	1	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.4	7.0			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Declines along traditional coastal wintering sites, sea level rise warrant SC status.(SC)
Declining globally. Foraging areas used during winter and passage can be managed for locally.(SC)
Threats to wintering habitat from sea level rise and flooding events. (SC)
Nonbreeding habitat overlaps broadly with breeding habitat - the emphasis here is on coastal saltmarshes and grasslands. (SC)
regional declines and habitat sensitivity-- supports SC.(SC)
CBC data over past forty years show slight downward trend(SC)
wintering numbers have been way down in many areas where it was formerly common for several years now. Not showing any signs of increasing yet. (SC)
Agree with panelists' opinions.(SC)
CBC graph shows decline since 1990.(SC)
Eastern population is decreasing but not at a rate where NJ's migrant and wintering populations are at risk of being endangered. Given the threats to non-breeding population, should be special concern. (SC)
Not sure if it should be SC or T, but it is certainly in some trouble.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Wintering numbers in historic strongholds (i.e. Delaware Bayshore) are down, especially since Hurricane Sandy. More frequent and extreme flooding events through salt marshes likely a big reason. (Major issues here with sea level rise; see results from breeding survey in 2010: <http://www.njaudubon.org/portals/10/research/pdf/njrb3.11r.pdf>) Species perhaps in danger of being extirpated as breeding bird in next 10-20 years. (E)

Migrants and overwintering birds still reliably found in suitable habitat. (It seems the Delaware Bayshore is the last remaining breeding stronghold in NJ. (E)

Currently species of special concern. (Currently endangered. Breeding status not well known and localized. (E)

small population size and CBC counts are erratic and decreasing (Population is still in decline, it has a small population size, specific habitat requirements, and there are many threats to the breeding population. (E)

Keep status and continue to support foraging habitats. (Lost from more areas even in last 20 years. I interpret BBS, atlas, and eBird data to show that there's less than 50 breeding pairs in NJ. (E)

Winter populations seem to be more stable. (BBS data show a very slow decrease in the East. In NJ, harriers nest mainly in tidal saltmarsh, which is severely threatened by sea level rise. Interior grasslands suitable for nesting harriers are also a scarce commodity. (T)

CBC graph misleading due to erroneous data in 1930. CBC data over past forty years show slight downward trend. (Never common as a breeding bird, but number of nesting pairs has dropped to near zero. (E)

wintering populations steadily declining. crash in microtis populations due to increasing massive tidal flooding events probably the cause. (currently breeding in only a few locations. Steady decline. Seriously threatened by habitat loss and degradation. (E)

The number of migrants has also decreased in the Great Swamp. The numbers passing the Cape May Hawk Watch are somewhat less than 30 years ago. (The numbers have declined dramatically. They used to be somewhat common at the Great Swamp, but I haven't seen one there during the breeding season in many years. The area of appropriate habitat has declined. (E)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Sharp-shinned Hawk (*Accipiter striatus*) / Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Special Concern**

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	1	12	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		7.0	5.2				

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

I continue to maintain support for T. The population is thought to be well under 100 pairs. It seems to seek out the most optimal habitats for itself in New Jersey, just the very habitats that are in the decline, so it remains a good indicator of optimal old growth forest health.(T)

Sticking with SC for all aforementioned reasons.(SC)

Difficult to assess until next Breeding Bird Atlas, but I think we all agree that this is a low-density breeder...the near-consensus on SC seems appropriate. (SC)

Scarce breeder in NW corner of the state.(SC)

Few nesting in NJ and potentially difficult to survey for. Should be on our radar.(SC)

Breeding status is a BIG question mark and certainly low density in the state.(SC)

Changing my vote from S/S to SC based on comments from others in Round 2.(SC)

Uncommon, dependent on a declining food source, bears attention.(SC)

Breeding population is increasing and has low threats, but the breeding population size is small, esp. in NJ. We need to keep an eye on NJ's population.(SC)

A secretive breeding species, but certainly uncommon in the state.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

NJ is at the edge of the species' nesting range and not easy to confirm as a breeder. (SC)

As scarce breeders little is known about them in NJ. (U/U)

Likely not covered well by most surveys; definitely a low-density inhabitant of the NW corner of the state and apparently nowhere else.

Competition from other species?(SC)

Essentially a peripheral nesting species, but I'm happy to go with SC for this one given the declines in migrant count data that suggest a rangewide problem.(SC)

The comments for SC I think would still work for T, which is what I still support. We can't accurately estimate the population but does anyone think it's over 100 pairs?(T)

This species is a peripheral breeder in NJ(S/S)

Small population in the state and very difficult to detect breeding due to secretive nature.(SC)

Some protection should be afforded- low density breeder may be hard to protect.(SC)

Low BBS numbers must be interpreted in light of difficulty observing during breeding season. Reliance on songbirds for main food source is concerning since so many songbirds are declining.(SC)

Breeding population is increasing and has low threats, but the breeding population size is small, esp. in NJ. We need to keep an eye on NJ's population.(SC)

I agree that confusion with Cooper Hawk probably accounts for this species being over-represented on e-bird and elsewhere.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Not many June eBird records in NJ over the last 10 years. 2nd NY and PA Breeding Atlases indicate confirmed blocks have increased 165% and 2%, respectively since the 1980s.(SC)

Despite declines, this is essentially a peripheral breeding species, with only a few nesting here.(S/S)

A very low density breeder in northern NJ, this bird should have attention paid to it. I've never personally seen a SSHA nest in NJ, it would be hard to keep track of their nesting success, past researchers and nest abandonment conclusions have been drawn to human disturbance. An extremely sensitive species to nest in the most densely populated state in the US.(SC)

Currently species of special concern. Breeding status/locations not well known.(SC)

Small population size even though population is increasing. (SC)

Data deficient but still a further decline in the state. I support elevating from SC to T, and all that relates to their mature forest habitat requirements. (T)

BBS data suggests a low but relatively stable population. Breeding status very difficult to determine due to secretive nature of the species, and especially due to difficulty distinguishing this species from Cooper's Hawk. eBird and BBS databases likely clouded with misidentified Cooper's Hawks. (U/U)

Sharp-shinned Hawks are so seldom encountered during the breeding season in NJ that it's difficult to know what their status might be.(U/U)

They are scarce breeding birds in NJ. I never see them during the summer.(SC)

This species seems to be range-edge, perhaps not picked up well in surveys.(SC)

Sharp-shinned Hawk (*Accipiter striatus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable**

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	5.4			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Until the number of migrants approaches the historic levels, I think it should be monitored. (SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

The species has been declining significantly as a passage migrant. Whether this is due to population declines, lack of weather to convey them to the coast, or a changing climate causing them to winter farther north is unknown. More needs to be known about this species to conclude it is secure.(SC)

Though still numerous in migration, the bird has faced serious declines in NJ (long term HW data). It is not nearly as at-risk in NJ during migration and winter as it is during breeding season, but I'll choose SC because of the declines.(SC)

Overall population is increasing with low threats non-breeding - more abundant in NJ winter and during migration(S/S)

The migration numbers at Cape May are nowhere near levels of 30 years ago.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Migrant counts are still relatively strong here (especially at Cape May).(S/S)

Regional declines support current SC status. (SC)

Although migration counts are down, CBC counts remain strong. Migratory short-stopping and changing weather patterns are likely responsible for lower migration counts. (S/S)

Numbers of Sharp-shinned Hawks have declined significantly at Cape May in recent decades. CBC numbers have not shown an increase associated with birds wintering farther north due to the availability of feeders. Ignore the 1930 point on the CBC graph.(SC)

Then numbers passing by the Cape may Hawk Watch are much lower than they were in the 1980's.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Cooper's Hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	2	11	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			6.0	5.8			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

BBS shows increasing trend. Numerous and widespread NJ eBird records over the last 10 years. 2nd NY and PA Breeding Atlases indicate confirmed blocks have increased 238% and 86%, respectively since the 1980s.(SC)

This species has increased as a breeder in NJ and regionwide. The "species occurrence" map is misleading (no breeding is listed for Cape May post-2010, where the species is a regular breeder - actually, no post-2010 breeding is shown for much of South Jersey!).(S/S)

Currently species of special concern. Breeding status/locations not well known. (SC)

Increase in all data, and often attributed to suburbanization and fragmentation. I support removing SC status. Predation pressure may be causing declines in scarcer bird species as well. (S/S)

Increasing. (S/S)

Cooper's Hawks have recovered strongly from the lows of the 1970's and are now nesting all over the state. Although preservation of forested areas is important to them, they seem to be willing to nest in any small woodlot, often near habitation.(S/S)

The reduced number of sightings in the NJ Biotics map is probably related to the lower priority of reporting after the species status was upgraded.(S/S)

Cooper's Hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	11	0	2	0
Avg. CONF				6.4			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Increasing. (S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Northern Goshawk (*Accipiter gentilis*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Not Reached

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	11	3	0	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF	4.8	4.7					

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

I still think that E status would trivialize other scare/ rare landbirds that we don't treat with such elevated status. Northern Goshawk is a species with a huge (holarctic) range largely covered by intact habitat - New Jersey is peripheral to the range and I don't think it makes sense to maintain E status here.(T)

Large majority for E here(E)

NOGO should stay at E status for all the aforementioned statements(E)

This is a very low density breeder and population will always be low in the state. Warrants keeping as Endangered.(E)

No evidence suggesting that it shouldn't remain E.(E)

As noted before, never a common breeder, but seems to have disappeared from the areas where it was formerly rare, but regular.(E)

Sticking with endangered on this one.(E)

Fluctuations in places like PA where numbers are greater suggest keeping an eye on even our small numbers here.(E)

Currently listed as E but no longer declining in NJ and the surrounding region, which warrants downlisting to T.(T)

Based on all of the comments I think it should be kept as E.(E)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Difficult case. I can hear the argument that it's occurrence as a breeder was always marginal but look at the habitats it chooses and their distribution in New Jersey is not marginal, though it is regionally specific. There are certainly less than 100-250 individuals. It's confusing why we haven't had the same thoughts about Sharp-shinned Hawk. And now they seem to be re-colonizing northern Pennsylvania and southern New York so we may have more in our future as well(T)

Very low density breeder(E)

Peripheral species but given data presented here, should be maintained at E(E)

Scarce local breeder in the NW part of the state; keep as E.(E)

Currently endangered; small population in NJ and sensitive to disturbance.(E)

I'm swayed by the argument that the species is a peripheral breeder - it is even more so than Sharpie. Still, NY and PA BBAs show overall block declines of 20% and 28%, respectively since 1980s. However in NJ, a T or SC status may be more appropriate.(T)

Currently Endangered and I see no reason to think it's status has Improved to warrant changing.(E)

Never a common breeder in NJ, but seems to have disappeared from most of the areas in the NW counties where it was rare, but regular.(E)

Small breeding population that depends on a habitat type that is not coming back any time soon.(E)

Currently listed as E but no longer declining in NJ and the surrounding region, which warrants downlisting to T.(T)

Very scarce. I am on the fence between E and T.(E)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Scarce breeding in NW NJ, has disappeared from some former nesting locations at the eastern edge of the highlands and ridge & valley. Keep E status.(E)

Given its peripheral distribution and apparent stability the species should be monitored by doesn't warrant E or T designation. (SC)

I'm willing to vote for ranking this as a T species, but keeping a peripheral breeder ranked as state endangered, in my mind, trivializes the lower status of NJ birds like Eastern Whip-poor-will that are seriously declining rangewide.(T)

It's population is probably under 250 and a E status is appropriate. (E)

Northern Goshawk seems to have disappeared from some of the places where it was known to be nesting during the 1980's in Morris and Sussex counties. There have been fewer than 10 eBird reports during the nesting season in the past ten years, all in Warren and Sussex(E)
Status seems unchanged. Very low density breeder.(E)

It would be hard to determine effective conservation measures, but some should be taken.(T)

Rare, dependent on large forest patches, and possibly sensitive to disturbance.(E)

Small population size with moderate threats to breeding population, which is erratic and peripheral in eastern US but stable. Breeders in NJ may be limited by nest sites (loss of hemlock/large coniferous trees).(T)

Not too familiar with the Northern Goshawk, but the comments from Round 1 convince me it should be listed.(E)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Very few NJ eBird records over the last 10 Mays and Junes. 2nd NY and PA Breeding Atlases indicate total blocks have declined 20% and 28%, respectively since the 1980s.(E)

Peripheral species, so I don't know if it really deserves listing, as it is likely stable as a breeder across North America's massive boreal forest; however, it is a rare breeder in mature forests in Northern NJ, with declines in recent years. (SC)

Another low-density accipiter that should garner attention. Not many pairs breed in northern NJ, this small population should be monitored so we don't lose them as a breeder in the state. Personal observations have witnessed a slight increase over the past few years, "invasion" years aside. (SC)

Very low population numbers. Breeding status/locations not well known. (E)

population stable in NJ and the region but in very low numbers. Still has some threats to breeding population. If not addressed it may be endangered. (T)

Keep status. I think it was properly listed, initially, even though it is thought to be recent colonizer. (E)

Very little trend data available for the breeding season, but populations clearly very low. (SC)

Northern Goshawk seems to have disappeared from some of the places where it was known to be nesting during the 1980's in Morris and Sussex counties. There have been fewer than 10 eBird reports during the nesting season in the past ten years, all in Warren and Sussex.(E)
Range-edge; but CBC suggests it's been declining.(U/U)

Northern Goshawk (*Accipiter gentilis*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable**

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	11	1	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	5.0			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Uncommon and declining regionally.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Species status varied across the US. Again, we are peripheral to much of their population with few individuals apparently lingering into the winter.(S/S)

I would maintain that this is a rare species year-round (including breeding season) and that it is largely peripheral in NJ, and that barely occurs in the state at all during non-flight years (birds coming south from the boreal forest).(S/S)

Regional decline supports SC status(SC)

Declining over the past 20 years according to CBC data.(SC)

Stable global population that shows erratic changes in periphery of range (NJ). (S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Rare to scarce migrant at hawkwatches. Not many winter records according to eBird.(SC)

Nearly peripheral. This is a rare species here in NJ during winter and migration, with some years of slight "invasions" and other years of near absence.(S/S)

Based on low numbers and decline in CBC counts.(SC)

Large CBC and Hawkwatch declines support leaving it at SC. (SC)

A very uncommon and irruptive migrant and winter visitor. Not frequent enough to give any indication of its status elsewhere.(S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Red-shouldered Hawk (*Buteo lineatus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Endangered

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	11	2	0	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF	5.5	6.0					

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Low density breeder that is suffering from habitat loss.(E)

Habitat loss/degradation, apparent range constriction within state/region(E)

Keep as E; requires high-quality forests and forested wetlands. (E)

The bird is currently listed as Endangered, and its historic breeding range has shrunk. Nearby states show increases suggesting that we could manage for this species and have a positive impact on the regional population.(E)

Both Red-shouldered Hawk and Barred Owl are forest raptors that have benefited from forest maturation in NY and PA as evidenced by the second BBAs for these states. However, until a second BBA is done in NJ that indicates similar increase, I conservatively say leave it at E.(E)

I can't support changing this species from Endangered status until it starts to return to traditional sites where was previously found. It's doing well in select areas, but still nearly absent from others.(E)

Willing to change vote from T to E based on comments from other panelists.(E)

Rare, restricted range, and declining due to habitat loss.(E)

Currently listed as E but the increase in the population in the surrounding states (and in some areas in NJ) warrants downlisting. (T)

I agree that the breeding population is low, but I don't think they are in danger of being extirpated. they are still seen regularly in their strongholds (e.g. Great Swamp). The 2nd NY atlas showed a healthy increase of 23%. Maturing forests should help RSHA.(T)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Keep as E. This species is a good indicator of high-quality forested habitats. Has declined quite a bit in the southern half of the state as a breeder.(E)

RSHA deserves continued E status due to low numbers and no apparent rebounding. Management of forest tracts to reduce fragmentation should be a priority for their recovery within the state.(E)

Continue as E status, given habitat issues and disappearance from southern half of state. (E)

Perhaps this deserves SC, but regionwide, this species is doing OK at the moment - I find it extremely hard to justify ranking this as Endangered.(SC)

E status is probably best, declining and overall population is probably not above 500.(E)

Major population declines from mid- to end of 20th century. Habitat destruction primary cause. Population may be stable now, but at much lower level than previously, but loss of habitat to development continues.(E)

breeds in very specific habitats in fairly low numbers in the state. habitat loss is a problem and seems to be continuing to decline.(E)

Agree with panelists' opinions.(E)

Extremely rare due to habitat loss.(E)

Overall population has more than doubled and still increasing. Still low numbers in NJ and not fully recovered, but increasing and no longer likely to be extirpated. Not sure if T or SC. (T)

Low population and it is declining, but there are still some areas where it seems to be doing well.(T)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Status should be maintained as numbers continue to decline, especially through southern 2/3rd of state. Very few recent records in breeding season from southern NJ. (E)

NJ eBird data from the last 10 Junes indicates Red-shouldered Hawk occurrences more or less match the NJ Breeding Bird Atlas. 2nd NY and PA BBAs show total block increases of 23% and 55%, respectively since the 1980s.(E)

I would like to note RSHA breeds with low abundance in southern NJ, witnessing this species breeding in this part of the state evokes of being present in a pristine habitat. If this species declines in this area, it would be chipping away at the overall population of the state.(U/U)

Currently Endangered. Breeding status/locations not well known. (E)

population increasing throughout the region but with low population size. Threats to breeding population are relatively low according to 2016 PIF continental plan (SC)

Still just as low population with now even more restricted distribution. (E)

Populations seem to be relatively stable statewide. (S/S)

Major population declines from mid- to end of 20th century. Habitat destruction primary cause. Population may be stable now, but at much lower level than previously, but loss of habitat to development continues. (E)

Gone as a breeding species from many previously occupied locations. Habitat loss a concern.(T)

There are not a lot of Red-shouldered hawks left. There is still a good population in the Great Swamp and some other places.(T)

RSHA is a species that is holding on perhaps due to some forest habitat protections for forested wetlands. An important indicator for species for larger and older NJ forests.(E)

Red-shouldered Hawk (*Buteo lineatus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Not Reached**

Summary of Round 4 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	7	7	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			4.7	5.1			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Agree with other SC comments.(SC)

uncertain trends indicate a need to keep an eye on this species but not to the degree of our breeding population.(SC)

Despite increase in NY I think it should continue to be monitored.(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

a good number of individuals winter in S. NJ and land management should consider this going forward. (SC)

Should stay SC due to habitat preferences and low numbers overall.(SC)

I think the numbers should be monitored before switching to S.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Since this species prefers higher-quality forested wetlands in part, worth protecting wintering sites as well.(SC)

Some areas of regional northeast decline support a SC status(SC)

Agree with panelists' opinions.(SC)

CBC numbers increasing recently, but should remain of concern.(SC)

Currently SC. Overall population has more than doubled and still increasing which is also reflected in NJ CBC. Should be listed as stable. (S/S)

Population may be stable or slightly decreasing.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Hawkwatch and CBC totals variable but do not seem to indicate a decreasing trend.(SC)

increasing population but low population size, relatively low threats to non-breeding according to 2016 PIF continental plan(SC)

Was this species already recently changed from T to SC? I support SC status due to regional declines (BBS website).(SC)

Migration data from hawk watches and CBC's do not indicate any significant trends, although CBC numbers have increased somewhat in the past two decades.(S/S)

The number passing by the Cape may Hawk Watch seem to be fairly stable.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Broad-winged Hawk (*Buteo playpterus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	12	2	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.1	4.0			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Warrants monitoring as SC. Needs larger forests for breeding, so fragmentation is always an issue. Has disappeared from many locations in central NJ where it once bred.(SC)

I'll rank this as SC due to declines in migration counts. It seems to be in fairly good shape in NJ and region-wide, however.(SC)

Population could qualify for T status, but definitely SC is warranted given habitat sensitivity(SC)

BBS data show only a slight overall decline, but that may not be an adequate sampling method for a secretive forest raptor. Migration counts suggest more significant general decline.(SC)

data deficient species, but probably decreasing in abundance. (SC)

This forest species is sometimes hard to detect. I would support SC.(SC)

Low numbers; need for large tracts of mature woods with nearby open areas and water limits suitable breeding habitat.(SC)

Overall population increasing though not as much as RSHA. Fairly common in Delaware Water Gap but not as common in Highlands, possibly due to lack of forest understory. Keep as SC. (SC)

Based on the Round 1 comments I will change from no opinion to SC. Better monitoring seems to be needed with BRWH.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

eBird June data may be more indicative of current nesting range than ENSP occurrence data. 2nd NY and PA breeding bird atlases show total block increase of 1% and decrease of 16%, respectively since the 1980s.(SC)

I'm teetering on either side of deciding with this species. From the available datasets, I find that they are under represented. Personal observations of birds breeding in the northern part of Cape May County would indicate such.(S/S)

Currently species of special concern. Breeding status/locations not well known. (SC)

decreasing in NJ but increasing in region. Small population size and moderate threats to breeding population. (SC)

Keeping status the same because mature forest is a necessary habitat for species. (SC)

BBS data show only a slight overall decline, but that may not be an adequate sampling method for a secretive forest raptor. Migration counts suggest more significant general decline.(SC)

NJ Breeding Bird survey shows a long-term decline in nesting population, probably due to development of preferred habitat and encroachment by humans.(SC)

Broad-winged Hawk (*Buteo playpterus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	13	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				4.5			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

It's regional statuses and declines pull to the SC.(SC)

Non-breeding population currently listed as stable and overall population is increasing. Does not warrant being upgraded to SC. (S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

low population size, moderate threats to breeding population, and CBC is erratic. (SC)

Regional declines support SC status. (SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Barn Owl (*Tyto alba*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Threatened

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	1	12	1	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF	5.0	5.3	4.0				

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

A mentor of mine once called Barn Owl "the ultimate private property bird," meaning that detection of this species is extremely difficult due to their habit of occupying off-limits silos, barns, bridge overpasses, and abandoned buildings. Nevertheless, from pers comm with many north jersey birders, this species is basically gone from the NW quarter of the state and scarce everywhere except Salem/Cumberland. (E)

Regional declines are significant, likely due to habitat loss. (T)

Obvious declines, but data likely doesn't paint a complete picture here. Certainly a species of great concern on a regional level, which is a contributing factor. (T)

Species is now a rare breeder in NJ; has decreased substantially in South NJ marsh and farmland habitat. NJ represents a small part of the range, but regional declines have been alarming as well.(T)

I said E before but I think T is most accurate from the comments.(T)

Sharp decline in Barn Owl numbers over past few decades, likely due to habitat loss.(T)

declining due to habitat loss across the Eastern US. Changing agricultural practices seem to be the cause, but still has a few strongholds in state.(T)

Excellent candidate for conservation efforts(T)

Difficult to say this species should be considered threatened or endangered based on available statewide data, but lack of knowledge and available evidence suggest concern is warranted. (SC)

Overall population is low but increasing, though it appears to be declining in the NY/NJ/PA area. Not at risk of extirpation but may need more active mgmt to prevent it from being endangered. (T)

Based on the lack of breeding season records and the regional decline I would move this to T.(T)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Numbers down regionally; has disappeared from many former breeding areas, perhaps mirroring American Kestrel in some ways. (T)
NJ eBird data from last 10 years suggests species is in decline compared to NJ BBA from 1990's. 2nd NY and PA BBAs show big declines as well since 1980s.(T)
Species is now a rare breeder in NJ; has decreased substantially in South NJ marsh and farmland habitat.(T)
I feel this species is just about absent as a breeder in NJ. However, the general knowledge of owls is sometimes kept under wraps for their own protection. I do think that they would be a great candidate to place nest boxes in appropriate habitat. Personal observations are all virtually migrants or winter residents, which nest boxes will still serve well.(T)
population increasing in region but small population with moderate threats.(SC)
NJ Occurrence map is very incomplete compared to atlas. There seems to be less than 100 pair in NJ so I support changing SC to E. (E)
Sharp decline in Barn Owl numbers over past few decades, likely due to habitat loss. (T)
I don't have sufficient information to make a decision. However, the breeding population that used to be fairly strong in Morris, Somerset, and Hunterdon counties has largely disappeared over the past few decades, in part because of loss of nesting sites, especially old water towers. (U/U)
no longer breeding across most of the state, but still regularly nesting in some regions of state.(SC)
Focused nest searches always seem to turn up more owls than expected.(U/U)
The NJ Biotics map is not accurate as this species is under reported. There is a long-term (35+ yr) study tracking barn owls nesting in Salem and Cumberland counties (Colvin & Hegdal). This is taken from their 2014 report (The Barn Owl Research Foundation 2014): This study has demonstrated that barn owl populations must be assessed on a long-term basis to properly evaluate population trends. Localized barn owl populations are dependent upon a regional population for recruitment, and any conservation strategy must consider the regional relationship of fledgling dispersal and adult recruitment. Local efforts to produce barn owl fledglings appear to have more value for distant nesting populations than for the local area. The ability of barn owls to colonize widely was reflected by rapid spread of the species in the Eastern and Midwestern United States during the clearing of land for agriculture in the 1800s. In contrast to those findings, today, with progressive loss and changes in agricultural and grassland habitats in those regions, barn owl populations are sustained at lower levels or declining. Results of this study suggest a downward trend in the barn owl population within and near New Jersey over the past 35 years. Because barn owl abundance in southern New Jersey is dependent upon a larger regional population, the New Jersey trend is indicative of regional declines associated with ongoing urban sprawl and agricultural changes (e.g., residential development, loss of wetland/grassland habitats, loss of dairy farms/pastures, and emphasis on row crops and nursery production).(T)

Barn Owl (*Tyto alba*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Special Concern**

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	1	12	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		4.0	5.4				

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Migrating populations through Cape May should have some support in order to ensure success.(SC)
Regional-level issues here seem to support SC(SC)
Non-breeding habitat worth protecting; some birds in southern NJ are possibly year-round inhabitants.(SC)
Regional declines suggest keeping this species SC for passage migrant.(SC)
Keep at SC, limited data(SC)
Agree with this panelists comment. Difficult to say this species should be considered threatened or endangered based on available statewide data, but lack of knowledge and available evidence suggest concern is warranted.(SC)
Low numbers on CBC count, overall decline.(SC)
Currently listed as SC. Overall population is increasing and does not warrant a T status.(SC)
I think the regional decline is significant enough to warrant T status.(T)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Barn Owl are detected regularly during fall passage in Cape May, and were trapped and banded in Cape May more regularly two decades ago. The fact that they pass through regularly and yet are declining regionally suggest we should be concerned with supporting them during passage. The general increase of the species across its range suggests against increased listing of status to T or E.(SC)
Habitat requirements remain largely the same; some birds along Delaware Bayshore may remain year-round. (SC)
Nonbreeding habitat similar to that used for breeding. Some migrate, while others seem to be resident year-round.(T)
Regional concerns should support SC(SC)
Regional declines support a SC status(SC)
Difficult to say this species should be considered threatened or endangered based on available statewide data, but lack of knowledge and available evidence suggest concern is warranted. (SC)
Overall population is low but increasing. Keep at SC. (SC)
Significant regional decline. The 2nd NY atlas showed a 78% decrease.(T)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Detections at Cape May during Sep/Oct show that the species moves through the region regularly. Should be of interest given the obvious decline on a regional level. Wintering birds found routinely in some evergreen groves along Delaware Bayshore, but much reduced from former numbers. (T)
NJ eBird data from last 10 years suggests species is in decline compared to NJ BBA from 1990's. 2nd NY and PA BBAs show big declines as well since 1980s.(T)
Nonbreeding habitat similar to that used for breeding. Some migrate, while others seem to be resident year-round.(SC)
CBC count small and erratic. Moderate threats to non-breeding population.(SC)
Regional declines support a SC status(SC)
Habitat loss affects migrant and wintering birds as well as breeders. (SC)
Rarely seen in migration. CBC numbers have ranged from 1 to 12 over the past 25 years.(U/U)
Harsh winter weather may limit this species' occurrence and range in NJ.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Barred Owl (*Strix varia*) / Breeding Status



Consensus Not Reached

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	8	6	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		5.1	5.2				

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

I think this species is "over-ranked" in NJ. I'd be happy with considering it SC, but T seems like an odd ranking given the expansion of this widespread species' range.(SC)

Hard to really know. Seems to be increasing in some areas.(SC)

Current status should be kept, no significant changes to population have occurred.(T)

Although it seems do be doing well in most areas where it occurs, the habitat it breeds in is decreasing.(T)

Dependence on large tracts of mature forest, overall population size is small.(T)

Seems to be doing well, so support moving from T to SC(SC)

Keep as T due to preference for high-quality forested wetlands that also benefit other T&E species.(T)

Currently threatened and habitat is also greatly reduced.(T)

The population in NJ is at least stable if not increasing and the overall population has increased by 99%. We shouldn't delist it, but we should downlist it. (SC)

My own opinion is that it should be SC but I understand and agree with many of the comments supporting T. However, it is doing much better than Red-shouldered Hawk, is increasing in NY, and benefiting from maturation of forests.(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

T status should be kept. Though slightly increasing in personal observations.(T)

Currently threatened. Currently doing well at some locations, but habitat is still threatened and there's not enough evidence to downlist.(T)

Keep at T; uses same habitats as Red-shouldered Hawk and requires good to high-quality forests and forested wetlands.(T)

While this species has expanded its range into western states, that doesn't change its dependence on older-aged and intact forests in NJ. I've not seen data showing an increasing population in NJ, only stability within the larger forest tracts, not all of which are protected lands. Prior to delisting there should be a plan that includes conservation of forested lands managed for older-growth and interior-dependent wildlife, sufficient to maintain a recovered population. (T)

These birds depend on mature wet woods, a habitat under constant threat in NJ. Support keeping it as T.(T)

Benefits most from large forested tracts. Suitable nesting habitat still at a premium.(T)

Population seems to be increasing in NJ and across the region for this species. I support moving it from Threatened to SC. (SC)

Seems to be doing well over most of the state, but small population is vulnerable, especially to forest fragmentation.(SC)

Range of opinions here suggest we should pick the mid-point, which will suggest keeping an eye on the species but not dilute the threatened category with a species that really doesn't seem to me to merit it.(SC)

The population in NJ is at least stable if not increasing and the overall population has increased by 99%. We shouldn't delist it, but we should downlist it. (SC)

Maturing of forests seems to be benefitting this owl.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Population/presence in favored areas seems stable, but requires larger intact forests and wooded wetlands/corridors. Keep as T.(T)
I am surprised at the bi-modal distribution of the voting results. I find it difficult to justify treating this as a threatened species in NJ. The species has undertaken a recent huge expansion of its range to the west and is doing OK at a population level.(S/S)
The population looks to be higher than a T species so good to go SC. Numbers and most populations look not to be declining very much.(SC)
Seems to be doing well over most of the state, but small population is vulnerable, especially to forest fragmentation.(SC)
Keep it as Threatened. Probably increasing in population, but not enough to change status at this point.(T)
Continent-wide Barreds are doing well, but their low numbers in the state and dependence on unfragmented old growth mean that they are closer to becoming endangered than they are to being downlisted to species of concern.(T)
Large overall population that has nearly doubled and still increasing. and threats breeding have been reduced. In NJ, breeders are increasing and detected in more suburban areas. Time to move to SC or delist altogether. (SC)
Increasing in NY and PA and may be doing so here as well.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

NJ eBird data suggests species occurs in more areas than in the 1990's during the NJ BBA. 2nd NY and PA BBAs both show significantly more blocks reporting Barred Owl compared to 1980s. Still seems most associated with extensive, unfragmented forest.(T)
Population increasing and widespread, but population size is still small. (SC)
Doesn't seem to be in serious further decline. Keep as T. (T)
Currently doing well or even increasing at some locations. (S/S)
Much reduced from first half of 20th century due to habitat loss and fragmentation. Continued habitat loss and woodland fragmentation threatens their existence in parts of the state.(T)
There are still some healthy populations - in the Great Swamp and elsewhere. However, the amount of habitat is being reduced.(T)
This species depends on intact and unfragmented forests, including but not limited to wetland forests. Fragmentation remains a very real threat to long term viable and connected populations and good foraging habitat.(T)

Barred Owl (*Strix varia*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Not Reached

Summary of Round 4 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	8	6	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		4.9	5.0				

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Same rationale as breeding status.(SC)
As breeding status(SC)
T status should be kept.(T)
largely non-migratory, same status as breeding.(T)
Dependence on large tracts of mature forest, overall population size is small.(T)
Same reasons apply to non-breeding status and to breeding.(SC)
T status should be year-round for this year-round resident.(T)
Largely non-migratory and habitat limited.(T)
The population in NJ is at least stable if not increasing and the overall population has increased by 99%. We shouldn't delist it, but we should downlist it. (SC)
Should be the same status as breeding.(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

T status should be kept year round.(T)

Year-round resident; T.(T)

Year-round resident within occupied habitats and breeding territories. (T)

Given its non-migratory status, protection of this species is warranted and extends year-round.(T)

Year round resident(SC)

Same reasons as for breeding status.(SC)

Similar to breeding season reasoning, split votes suggest something in between is appropriate.(SC)

Status should be the same as breeding. (SC)

Permanent resident.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

As a year-round resident and non-migratory should be T in non-breeding seasons.(T)

Non-migratory(T)

Largely non-migratory, BUT there is strong evidence that the species is irruptive.(S/S)

To follow reasoning for breeding as SC. Local recruitment may be important and there also may be small irruptions from more northern populations.(SC)

Same reasons as for breeding status.(S/S)

Not migratory to any great extent. treat same as breeding(T)

Same concerns as breeding season: low numbers, rare preferred habitat.(T)

Large overall population that has nearly doubled and still increasing. and threats breeding have been reduced. In NJ, breeders are increasing and detected in more suburban areas. Time to move to SC or delist altogether. (SC)

This owl is a permanent resident.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

NJ eBird data suggests species occurs in more areas than in the 1990's during the NJ BBA. 2nd NY and PA BBAs both show significantly more blocks reporting Barred Owl compared to 1980s. Still seems most associated with extensive, unfragmented forest.(T)
population increasing and widespread, but population size is still small. (SC)

Largely non-migratory so needs same T status as non-breeder. (T)

The Barred Owl is non-migratory, so the same concerns about habitat loss and fragmentation apply to non-breeding season as well. CBC numbers have remained relatively constant for the past thirty years.(T)

Permanent resident.(T)

The population is non-migratory so the breeding birds are the same as those in the non-breeding season, dependent on healthy and unfragmented forests for cover and foraging.(T)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Long-eared Owl (*Asio otus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Not Reached

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	9	0	0	5	0	0
Avg. CONF		4.9			4.0		

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Still data deficient.(U/U)

Keep current status(T)

We don't know less about it now than we did when it was listed T, so keep it T.(T)

Hard to determine actual breeding numbers, keep as T.(T)

This species probably does still breed in the state and should get some targeted survey treatment either independently or as part of a breeding bird atlas. (T)

Currently listed as T and declining, but peripheral in NJ. Shouldn't change status without additional data(T)

Switching from U to T based on round 3 comments.(T)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Low-density breeder, keep as T.(T)

Small breeding population warrants continued T status.(T)

Conservatively say leave it a T.(T)

I don't think there is sufficient data to rank this species, for which NJ is large peripheral to its breeding range.(U/U)

I think we know enough to rank this species as at least T--they're rare and could benefit from being protected.(T)

Currently listed as T and declining, but peripheral in NJ. Shouldn't change status without additional data. (T)

It's interesting (and probably not surprising) that we are having trouble reaching a consensus on all of the owls. I frankly don't know what to make of this species as a breeding bird in NJ.(U/U)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

This notoriously shy species is hard to rank. Probably never a common breeder in NJ and towards southern periphery of range.(U/U)

This is a species showing declines both in nesting and as a passage migrant coast to coast...even given the difficulty in surveying. (T)

Data-deficient - tough to rank with confidence at the moment.(U/U)

Very few are known and doesn't look hopeful that there are many undiscovered others(E)

While undetermined is probably correct, difficulty of detection may be problematic.(T)

Population of what's known needs protection.(T)

Low density and complex habitat needs merit concern. No reason to remove it from threatened list.(T)

NJ not likely a breeding location of LEOW due to being on periphery of breeding range and declining global population - documented occurrences in NJ are wintering roosts. (N/A)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Not many NJ eBird records over the last ten years. Local BBAs indicate low detection rate. 2nd NY and PA BBAs show significantly fewer blocks recording this species.(T)

Definitely a data-deficient species in NJ.(U/U)

Very hard to detect, but with some effort we will probably find some breeders. Previous BBS counts have found several pairs nesting in northern NJ with many additional suspected. It would serve them well to have adequate protection and a quiet place to rear their young.(T)
Fits population criteria for E. (E)

No reliable population trends due to the secretive nature of this species. Breeding Bird Atlas data and other anecdotal evidence suggests a very low population density. (SC)

Although Long-eared Owl bred in a variety of locations prior to 1950, it is now peripheral to the main breeding areas. Nomadic nesting birds, so hard to pinpoint effect of habitat change.(SC)

Long-eared Owl (*Asio otus*) / Non-Breeding Status

 **Consensus Not Reached**

Summary of Round 4 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	11	1	0	2	0	0
Avg. CONF		5.0	4.0		4.5		

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Species is at risk on winter roosts; declines suggest SC ranking.(SC)

Keep current status(T)

Even the SC votes are negative--should be T.(T)

Wintering numbers down markedly in recent decades(T)

Stay with T; winter roost sites definitely worth protecting.(T)

Large winter roosts appear to be a thing of the past suggesting a greatly reduced feeder population. (T)

Currently listed as T and declining, but peripheral in NJ. Shouldn't change status without additional data(T)

Most conservative thing to do is keep it at T.(T)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Noticeable decline in typical winter roost sites.(SC)

Winter roost sites are definitely worth protecting and always subject to disturbance.(T)

While we may not know much about non-breeding distribution or numbers, regional declines and declines in known roosts strongly suggest T. (T)

Same as above. Roost sites prone to disturbance effects. 2016 PIF report considers it a continental watch species for decline. (T)

Presence at winter roosts consistently down from 20-30 years ago(SC)

I think we know enough to rank this species as at least T--they're rare and could benefit from being protected.(T)

Currently listed as T. Declines do not warrant downlisting. (T)

I agree that winter numbers appear to be down.(T)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Winter roost sites are vulnerable to disturbance from overzealous photographers and birders. Habitat loss for foraging areas still an issue. (T)

Winter roost numbers are way down from historic figures suggesting that source populations have declined. This is further supported by breeding bird atlas declines in NY. Given the historic wintering densities, T status is warranted.(T)

Regionally declining, and PIF Yellow Watch List Species (PIF 2016)(T)

Just about as tough to rank in this season as in breeding season, though there are far more nonbreeding season records.(U/U)

CBC declines and regional concerns should grant SC(SC)

Presence at winter roosts consistently down from 20-30 years ago.(SC)

Known roosts site should be protected.(SC)

Some migrants depend on NJ for winter. CBC data, while not well-suited to owls, show a long-term decline.(T)

Small population size, very steep declines (91% of population already lost), and moderate threats to non-breeding population. Non-breeding population not likely to be extirpated in NJ, but further declines may eventually warrant endangered listing. (T)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Not many NJ eBird records over the last ten years. Local BBAs indicate low detection rate. 2nd NY and PA BBAs show significantly fewer blocks recording this species.(T)

Data-deficient species here.(U/U)

Wintering migrants may be contributing to a continued low density breeder in the state- wintering birds choosing to stay and breed. Pressure among avian enthusiasts to find LEOW will cause major disturbance, even if the bird(s) are not flushed. There has been a noticeable decline in their wintering numbers from personal observations.(SC)

declining trend and small population size, moderate threats to non-breeding population. On 2016 PIF continental watch list for declining species. (T)

CBC and eBird declines. Regional declines as well support granting a SC status. (SC)

Numbers fluctuate year to year in migration (where records are mainly banding at Cape May) and winter roosts. CBC numbers vary widely, so hard to draw any conclusion, but presence at winter roosts seems to be consistently down from previous century.(SC)

Little is known about this species locations in NJ except they are scarce and rely on dense stands free from disturbance.(E)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Short-eared Owl (*Asio flammeus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Endangered

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	12	0	0	0	1	0	1
Avg. CONF	5.0				5.0		5.0

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Not currently a breeding species in NJ, unfortunately.(U/U)

Likely extirpated but needs to have coverage (E)

But could also see argument for N/A by this point or soon into the future, for sure. (E)

Doesn't seem to be any disagreement about status, only how to categorize a species that once bred here but doesn't now (probably). (E)

Willing to change to E to reach consensus. Former breeder along Delaware Bay and might someday return, although seems unlikely at present.(E)

Keep as E, as species has attempted nesting to our south in the last decade (MD, & possibly NC), so it's not impossible to think they could breed again in NJ.(E)

If it is still breeding, it is doing so in very low numbers. Any breeding birds in NJ should be protected and attempts to maintain optimal breeding habitat would be beneficial to this and several other species.(E)

Currently listed as E. Should not delist unless data suggest extirpation of breeders in NJ.(E)

Despite (or because of) its disappearance, I feel strongly that it should be listed as E.(E)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Extirpated as a breeder for decades, in nonetheless should remain as E in case the species ever starts to breed here again.(E)

I previously voted Unknown, but there is no known nesting in NJ and not likely in the future (given its habitat requirements and general pop decline). (N/A)

I doubt that there are any breeding Short-eared Owls anywhere in NJ.(U/U)

Rare or extirpated grassland-dependent predator. Only reason not to make it E is if we say we've given up.(E)

Currently listed as E. Should not delist unless data suggest extirpation of breeders in NJ. (E)

Already extirpated.(E)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

I don't believe the species has bred in the state in many years. Possibly could breed at larger wetlands/grasslands along Delaware Bay or Walkkill River region. (E)

Breeding status in NJ unknown. Regionally declining, and PIF Common Bird in Steep Decline (PIF 2016)(E)

It seems like there isn't enough recent data to suggest that there are ANY breeders in NJ left to rank.(U/U)

I voted E again but I also think that it is so ephemeral that S/S could be just as valid a decision. This is perhaps the rarest grassland breeder now (or gone for a little while, at least) and grassland species should not necessarily merit the same considerations as more native habitats should. (E)

If it's going to be considered a species that should occur in NJ then it should be considered endangered due to very low abundance and risk factors such as habitat needs (grassland) and nesting style (ground).(E)

According to range map, less likely to breed in NJ than LEOW. (N/A)

This bird seems to be gone as a breeder and Northern Harrier might follow it soon.(E)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Perhaps extirpated? Need more data here, but has obviously vanished as a breeding bird from both the state and the region. (E)

Probably extirpated as a nesting bird for decades.(N/A)

Despite potential local losses here, this is a peripheral breeder in NJ with a huge breeding range across northern North America.(U/U)

Small breeding population. (E)

Hasn't bred (in managed grasslands, marshes, or other habitats) in NJ since 1989?(U/U)

Habitat loss, filling of coastal marshes, etc., contributed to the decline of Short-eared Owl as a nesting species in NJ. Has not nested in the state since 1979. Some suitable habitat probably remains along the Delaware Bayshore, but recruitment from distant populations seems unlikely.(E)

Even during the NJ Breeding Bird Atlas in the 1990's there were no breeding Short-eared Owls found in the state. Things have not gotten better since then.(E)

Not sure this species has much chance of being anything but an occasional and peripheral breeding bird in NJ since the decline of grassland habitat. NJ's largest grassland landscape for this sp may be the remaining farmland associated with Delaware Bay marshes, of which the Barn Owl takes some advantage. There is limited nesting known to occur in DE, generally associated with Del Bay.(U/U)

Short-eared Owl (*Asio flammeus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Special Concern**

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	13	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.5				

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Sea level rise will only further hurt this species trying to survive in coastal marshes.(SC)

Loss of wintering habitat/degradation of wintering habitat for this species and others that rely on same areas. (SC)

Threats at inland sites from development, standard habitat degradation at coastal wintering sites (sea level rise, etc.).(SC)

Wintering areas subject to SLR and marsh subsidence, exacerbating the effects on prey base. (SC)

Should probably remain SC in light of numbers and habitat concerns.(SC)

Declining, but still occurs in good numbers most years. I support SC for this species(SC)

Looks to be declining enough and sensitive enough for SC status(SC)

Habitat needs during winter.(SC)

Currently SC and still declining. Should not be downlisted.(SC)

Wintering numbers are down.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Coastal areas where this bird used to be found reliably in winter see far less records, possibly due in part to a loss of high-marsh habitat and/or sea level rise. Inland sites could be threatened by development or harassment by overzealous photographers and birders. (T)

At least in NJ, SEOW hunt primarily in coastal salt marshes, which are also threatened by SLR. (SC)

Habitat issues (development of open country, flooding of marshes, etc.)(SC)

Regionally declining(SC)

SC seems appropriate given the restricted nature of the marsh and grassland habitats required by this species.(SC)

Looks to be declining enough and sensitive enough for SC status.(S/S)

Numbers fluctuate widely from year to year, but have been significantly lower over last 15 years compared to earlier decades.(S/S)

declining as a wintering bird on a parallel to N. Harrier and for the same reasons. (SC)

Hard to say what conservation efforts could be taken to effectively help SEOW.(SC)

Declining pretty steadily over the past twenty years.(SC)

Population is declining but still widespread on wintering grounds - not in danger of becoming endangered yet. (SC)

Not common in any areas that I am familiar with.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Wintering areas in coastal areas being threatened by sea level rise.(T)

CBC numbers seem steady.(SC)

The grasslands and especially marshes that Short-eared Owls use to hunt in migration and winter are under threat from development, succession, and in the case of coastal wetlands, sea level rise.(SC)

Localized populations during migration/winter. (SC)

population decreasing but population size is moderate. (SC)

Keep SC status to be in line with the regional declines. (SC)

CBC graph useless due to faulty data from 1930. Numbers fluctuate widely from year to year, but have been significantly lower over last 15 years compared to earlier decades.(SC)

There are still migrant owls passing through the state, but they seem scarcer than they were years ago.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Northern Saw-whet Owl (*Aegolius acadicus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Undetermined/Unknown

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	1	0	1	12	0	0
Avg. CONF		7.0		6.0	4.6		

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Another difficult to detect species. NJ isn't in their core breeding range, but is likely an annual nester in Atlantic White Cedar swamps in the Pine Barrens and in the highlands/ridge & valley region. (U/U)

too little known about NSWO breeding in NJ(U/U)

Largely a peripheral breeder, but mostly data deficient. Species is abundant (though cyclical, on a ~4 year boom cycle) as a breeder north of NJ.(U/U)

I think T is a good balance of data deficiency, cyclical breeding, and always low numbers in the summer season.(T)

Northern Saw-whet Owl is, at best, a peripheral breeder in NJ, possibly nesting annually in the northwest and occasionally in the Pine Barrens.

I know of one successful nest from Somerset Count in the early 2000's. Most nesting probably after irruption years, when large numbers of Saw-whets move south in late Autumn. (U/U)

Not a common NJ breeder due to being on periphery of breeding range, but may be more common as overall population has more than doubled and still increasing. (S/S)

The Birds of North America project says "Saw-whet Owls are secretive, nocturnal, and have irregular movement patterns..." That sums up why we don't have enough data on them.(U/U)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Likely small numbers nest here, but probably under-detected.(U/U)

Not enough breeding data to make an informed decision here.(U/U)

Species isn't listed but matches Long-eared Owl very well for rationale to list now. Data deficient however. (T)

Northern Saw-whet Owl is, at best, a peripheral breeder in NJ, possibly nesting annually in the northwest and occasionally in the Pine Barrens.

I know of one successful nest from Somerset Count in the early 2000's. Most nesting probably after irruption years, when large numbers of Saw-whets move south in late Autumn. (U/U)

I don't know if these birds are overlooked.(U/U)

Northern Saw-whet Owl (*Aegolius acadicus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	13	1	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.1	4.0		

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Banding studies at Cape May and Sandy Hook indicate wide fluctuations from year-to-year. This difficult to detect species is probably under-reported in migration and winter in NJ.(S/S)

Fairly common migrant through NJ and the region as a whole.(S/S)

Overall population has more than doubled and still increasing. (S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

The species is a fairly common migrant through NJ as revealed by regional banding studies (including at Cape May).(S/S)

Regional declines support SC status. (SC)

Numbers captured at banding stations, e.g., Cape May, vary widely from year to year, with major irruptions occurring every four or five years.

CBC data is not meaningful as the owls are very difficult to locate.(S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Belted Kingfisher (*Megaceryle alcyon*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	11	0	1	0
Avg. CONF				5.4			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

I probably need to research more. Cooper's Hawks on the rise may be influencing BEKI declines to some extent. (S/S)

Breeding bird data is limited, but doesn't show the decline exhibited in some of this species range.(S/S)

Belted Kingfisher (*Megaceryle alcyon*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	11	0	1	0
Avg. CONF				6.0			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

CBC data have shown a steady increase in the early winter population over the past 60 years.(S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Red-headed Woodpecker (*Melanerpes erythrocephalus*) / Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Threatened**

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	13	1	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		5.5	6.0				

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Specialized habitat requirements, ephemeral nature of suitable breeding sites, habitat loss, and small population size are good reasons for T status. (T)

This is a low-density breeder in NJ with significant populations in nearby Delaware and points south and west. It seems relatively straightforward that NJ could create habitat which would benefit RHW (savannah parkland with standing dead trees for nest sites) if so desired. (SC)

Willing to move toward consensus of T here, given unpredictable nature of species year-to-year, and with regard to other factors that are difficult to have a solid grasp on consistently. (T)

Very localized populations. Regionally declining, and PIF Yellow Watch List species (PIF 2016)(T)

Region-wide and NJ declines suggest T status.(T)

T looks good for current population but keep monitoring because looks to be increasing a little(T)

Red-headed Woodpecker has been an erratic breeding bird in NJ over the past fifty years. Pairs will colonize an area for a few years, then disappear for unknown reasons, perhaps habitat succession, loss of suitable nesting sites, availability of food. Therefore, hard to assess actual numbers. In years with big winter influx at good acorn crops, some migrants from elsewhere stay to breed.(T)

very localized and an extreme habitat specialist. Number of breeding sights in state relatively low and declining.(T)

Lots of touch and go with RHW in the state. I think appropriate habitat can easily be made to help support this species.(T)

Loss of historic habitat and shifts to new, less favorable habitat types threaten an already rare breeder.(T)

Overall population still declining, though species will readily colonize new areas as they are created. SPB suppression likely helped this species in NJ, but needs periodic forest disturbances to prevent it from becoming endangered. (T)

Widespread decline.(T)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

A habitat specialist that has seen declines on both a state and regional level. Numbers in some areas, i.e. interior Cumberland and Atlantic counties, seem to be on the rise if not holding steady; more work needed. (SC)

NJ eBird data from last 10 Junes suggest species is more widespread than the 1990s during the NJ BBA. 2nd NY and PA BBAs show steep declines since 1980s.(T)

This species has seen declines along much of the northern edge of its range, including much of NJ. (SC)

Very localized populations year-round. (T)

population declining slowly, moderately small population size, complex breeding habitat. On yellow watch list in 2016 PIF continental plan., and moderate threats to breeding population. If declines continue may become endangered. (T)

BBS and atlas data support T status. (T)

Red-headed Woodpecker has been an erratic breeding bird in NJ over the past fifty years. Pairs will colonize an area for a few years, then disappear for unknown reasons, perhaps habitat succession, loss of suitable nesting sites, availability of food. Therefore, hard to assess actual numbers. In years with big winter influx at good acorn crops, some migrants from elsewhere stay to breed.(T)

declining across the region. requires very specific habitat requirements.(T)

They seem to have disappeared from some areas where they used to be present.(T)

RHW seems limited by, but adapted, to patchy distribution of its habitat. Suppression of fire may be harmful, but prescribed burns may reduce and thin out heavy ground layers to their benefit. (T)

Red-headed Woodpecker (*Melanerpes erythrocephalus*) / Non-Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	1	11	1	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.3	6.0			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Winter sites are specific and somewhat ephemeral. Creating preferred habitat would be a good strategy preserving it's survival in the state. (SC)

Probably deserves some connectivity in year-round protection, especially as seen from a habitat-management perspective (SC)

Overall decline; worth protecting stands of oak trees where the birds often winter; that said does SC status really offer species' any protection (see comments under BCNH roost destruction at Silver Lake in Belmar).(SC)

Regional declines. (SC)

Rare and local in Winter and very uncommon in migration since this species is pretty uncommon now to the North of NJ and is basically a Southern species.(SC)

CBC count low and erratic. moderately small population size with declining trends and moderate threats to non-breeding population. SC but not T.(SC)

Uncommon and localized in winter, needs some attention.(SC)

Currently listed as T and population erratic and declining. It shouldn't be downlisted.(T)

There are more ebird sightings than I expected in recent years.(S/S)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Overall decline in regional population. It's worth trying to protect wintering birds (sometimes in groups), which often use parks with mature pin oaks in more urban parts of central and northeastern NJ. Perhaps more stable in Atlantic & Cumberland Counties.(T)

regional declines, especially to the north, would suggest that we should be concerned with non-breeding individuals here in NJ.(SC)

Localized in winter; perhaps some try to stay year-round. Same habitat concerns. (SC)

Regional declines (PIF 2016).(SC)

Many migrate, though some appear to be largely resident, using same habitat as during breeding season.(SC)

Regional declines, although with some recovery or new colonization as well.(SC)

Generally an uncommon migrant along the coast. Winter populations, as evidenced by CBC data, shows wild variations from year to year.

Peaks coincide with good acorn crops, so birds are apparently migrants attracted to the available food supply. The CBC graph is meaningless because of the erroneous data for 1930. For example, the CBC totals for the past 10 years, starting in 2006 were 3, 10, 11, 30,10,38, 7, 101, 8, 52.(SC)

migrates and winters in state in low numbers only. Breeding range North of us shrinking. (S/S)

Lots of touch and go with RHWO in the state. I think appropriate habitat can easily be made to help support this species. Encouraging winter residents to stay and breed will help.(SC)

Should be a favorite of ebirders and picked up on CBCs, but aren't reported in high numbers.(T)

Overall population still declining and dependent on mast crop yield. Same as breeding. (T)

Low population any time of year.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

See justification in breeding. (SC)

Winter numbers appear stable.(T)

Many migrate away from breeding sites, while others appear to be largely resident.(SC)

Very localized populations year-round. (T)

CBC count low and erratic. moderately small population size with declining trends and moderate threats to non-breeding population(T)

I support granting a SC status due to regional declines. (SC)

Generally an uncommon migrant along the coast. Winter populations, as evidenced by CBC data, shows wild variations from year to year.

Peaks coincide with good acorn crops, so birds are apparently migrants attracted to the available food supply. The CBC graph is meaningless because of the erroneous data for 1930. For example, the CBC totals for the past 10 years, starting in 2006 were 3, 10, 11, 30,10,38, 7, 101, 8, 52.(SC)

These woodpeckers are somewhat nomadic but my impression is that they are less common then before. there are a lot of recent sightings posted on e-bird.org, though. The 2nd NY State Breeding Bird Atlas showed a big decline.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Red-cockaded Woodpecker (*Picoides borealis*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Not Applicable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	0	0	2	10
Avg. CONF							7.9

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Extirpated. This bird does not occur in NJ and has not for many decades.(N/A)

I would like to note that the pine barrens would be an excellent place to try a reintroduction program.(N/A)

Doesn't nest. Zero suitable habitat, and range of species hasn't been close in many decades. (N/A)

Red-cockaded Woodpecker does not nest close to NJ and has never nested here. There is no suitable habitat.(N/A)

I'm not aware that there have ever been Red-cockaded Woodpeckers in NJ.(N/A)

This species does not occur in NJ and is not likely to colonize NJ successfully due to extremely limited suitable habitat. Further, no introduction should be conducted because it would only detract from restoration of extant, native species.(N/A)

Red-cockaded Woodpecker (*Picoides borealis*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Not Applicable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	0	0	2	10
Avg. CONF							7.9

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Extirpated.(N/A)

There is only one record of this species in NJ, a somewhat dubious specimen from Hoboken in the 1860's.(N/A)

I'm not aware that there have ever been Red-cockaded Woodpeckers in NJ.(N/A)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Northern Flicker (*Colaptes auratus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	2	11	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			6.0	5.4			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Initial population size masks the clear decline shown in various surveys.(SC)

Long term declines likely to continue as humans take down big snags (nesting) and develop open space (foraging). Used to be easy to spot in many areas.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Long-term significant declines are alarming.(SC)

It seems fairly clear that declines as substantial as those illustrated in the BBS ought to be taken seriously with a ranking of at least SC. The time to save (or at least rank) a species is while it's still common, of course.(SC)

Large sized territories and population is at least in the low 1000's, so S/S looks to be best.(S/S)

Declines over the past 40 years are alarming; this species needs attention.(SC)

2nd NY and PA BBAs show this species was still reported in over 90% of the blocks in both states. Overall block numbers stable since 1980's, though confirmed blocks declined -19% and -23%, respectively.(S/S)

Declining but still abundant and widespread and low threats to breeding population. (S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

While still common, this species has had long-term, substantial declines in NJ and regionally (high regional credibility of BBS data).(SC)

Still abundant but declining in NJ and regionally. If the decline continues, the population may become threatened. (SC)

BBS data decline but still good numbers. (S/S)

I am surprised by the Breeding Bird survey data, but if it is an accurate representation of the nesting population, then there is cause for concern. Competition for nest cavities may still be important.(SC)

All of the data show that Flickers have declined but they are still common breeding birds in many areas.(S/S)

Northern Flicker (*Colaptes auratus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	1	0	0	11	0	0	0
Avg. CONF	4.0			5.8			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

CBC erratic, but breeding population is declining regionally as well. If the decline continues, the population may become threatened. (E)

Northern Flicker is a very common migrant in fall at Cape May. CBC numbers for the state have remained relatively constant over the past 30 years, with a slight rise in birds per party hour. The CBC graph in the reference material is useless because of an error in the 1930 data.(S/S)

Flickers are still often encountered during the non-breeding season.(S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

American Kestrel (*Falco sparverius*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Threatened

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	10	1	0	0	1	0
Avg. CONF		6.0	6.0				

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Well-publicized declines both on a state and regional level. Eliminated as breeding bird from many former strongholds. (T)

NJ eBird data from last 10 Junes shows breeding range has contracted compared to NJ BBA period in the 1990s. Less suitable habitat.(T)

Steep declines in NJ and regionally over a long time period. (T)

American Kestrel has been declining for years along with other grassland dependent birds in NJ. With simple efforts of nest boxes, habitat restoration, working with farmers this species will likely succeeded from their low numbers currently. (SC)

Steep declines, limited breeding populations relying primarily on nest boxes. (T)

The population is declining, population numbers are small, and has moderate threats to the breeding population. If the trend continues, the species will likely be endangered. (T)

Population closely monitored in many places and still at T level of risk. (T)

The Breeding Bird survey results demonstrate what birders have known for a long time - the number of nesting Kestrels in NJ is drastically lower than it was just forty years ago. Number of factors probably involved, including competition for nesting cavities, changing agricultural practice, and regrowth of abandoned farmland. Nest box programs show good promise.(T)

Steep declines across it's historic breeding range within the state.(T)

They are much less common as breeding birds than they were before. Years ago, I found breeding Kestrels in Bernardsville, in the Great Swamp, and in Calfon. I haven't found them in these areas during the breeding season in many years.(T)

Another species declining with the increase in intensive ag (and loss of ag); however, unknown other factors are also contributing, given the 20-year+ decline in the eastern region. Nestbox programs provide a platform for researching this species, but are not the answer. Productivity is OK at monitored nests, so problems occur during post-fledging (for young) and when adults migrate and winter elsewhere.(T)

American Kestrel (*Falco sparverius*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Threatened

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		5.6					

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

T status should be kept year round.(T)

Across the board decline(T)

Dramatic declines in wintering numbers warrant T.(T)

Eastern birds show declines throughout the region. (T)

Wintering status is as much a concern as breeding status. Drastically decreasing as a migrant even at coastal sights were it was common until relatively recently.(T)

Migration counts way down; wintering numbers way down. State and regional.(T)

I don't see how this could only be SC based on big declines in numbers of migrants.(T)

Currently listed as T. Declines do not warrant downlisting to SC.(T)

I agree that this bird is in serious trouble.(T)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Overall decline regionally and vulnerability of suitable winter habitat cause for concern and T status.(SC)

The species is declining significantly in the NE/Mid-Atlantic and requires action to reverse the trend before it is too late.(T)

Migration counts way down; wintering numbers way down. State and regional. (T)

Regional declines (PIF 2016)(T)

I would keep the T status through the year for this sharply declining species.(T)

1000's, but not the previous 10,000's, still pass through every year-- lending to the idea that SC is better than T(SC)

Migration data has show substantial long-term decline at Cape May. CBC graph in reference material is useless because of erroneous data for 1930. Plot of more recent data shows decline from an average of about 700/yr from 1976 to 1985 to an average of about 100/yr for the period 2006 to 2015 despite increased observer effort(T)

still a fairly common migrant especially along the coast, but declining(SC)

Encouraging preferred winter habitat can help this species survive to the next year.(T)

If y-axis on the CBC graph wasn't ruined by an errant data point the trend would look awful over the past 30 years.(T)

Already listed as T for non-breeding and non-breeding population still declining. (T)

All indications are that the decline is continuing.(T)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Clear declines from CBC data and casual observations in the field. Numbers of migrants down in a big way; now very hard to find in NJ during winter. (T)

Hawkwatch and CBC numbers are down. Less suitable habitat.(SC)

This species is a common migrant, especially coastally. However, the species is experiencing widespread declines and in migration and winter, some use the same habitats/ territories occupied in spring/ summer for breeding.(T)

On the fence between S & SC- wintering kestrels have diminished, though some of that may be contributed by a changing climate. Numbers sometimes vary from fair to harsh winters and the food availability.(S/S)

Steep declines.(T)

CBC has been declining and some of NJ's breeding kestrels overwinter in NJ. (SC)

Grant SC status because of major regional declines. (SC)

Migration data has show substantial long-term decline at Cape May. CBC graph in reference material is useless because of erroneous data for 1930. Plot of more recent data shows decline from an average of about 700/yr from 1976 to 1985 to an average of about 100/yr for the period 2006 to 2015 despite increased observer effort.(T)

Declining as a breeding species in Eastern states. Wintering populations declining and numbers in migration way down versus historic numbers(SC)

Kestrels are also much less common during migration than they used to be. The numbers sen on at the Cape May Hawk Watch were much higher 30 years ago than they are today.(T)

Research suggests that kestrels have reduced survival in the non-breeding season (during migration and possibly in over-wintering areas).

New telemetry options may help identify where NJ and eastern US kestrels are migrating and wintering, first step toward understanding the mortality factors.(T)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Peregrine Falcon (*Falco peregrinus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Threatened

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	2	12	0	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF	5.0	5.3					

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Even T ranking seems high for Peregrine in NJ. They are doing extremely well. This species is not expected to occur at high density, and is currently doing extremely favorably compared to its known historic status in the state.(T)

T seems appropriate given stability in numbers(T)

I think a T or E status should exclude protection for any breeder on the Coast Plain at this point. It is an introduced breeder in that region. (T)

Population continues to grow. Not sure how many more nesting pairs can or should exist in the state.(T)

I switched E to T based on the many strong views opposed to E. Seems ridiculous based on the population size but it shouldn't be tough to bump it back to E when needed, and T still affords protection.(T)

Mixed feeling about this as the coastal plain nesting birds don't really belong there. Still, small population sensitive to disturbance.(T)

Worth keeping at T.(T)

this is one of the greatest conservation success stories of our lifetime. The species still warrants protection but perhaps not the same level as it has required to get it to this point.(T)

Currently listed as E but increase in population warrants downlisting to T.(T)

I believe the population is imperiled and in need of monitoring, but am switching to T based on several Round 3 comments. Agree that Peregrines nesting in coastal locations is probably a bad mix of T & E species.(T)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

E status should be kept for such a small population. I'd like to see pre DDT population estimates though.(E)

Not sure we'll reach consensus here, but given history and sensitivity to various factors, probably worth keeping at T. More work needed to examine effects of "local" birds on long-distance migrant and/or endangered shorebird species(T)

Species seems to be doing fairly well in NJ, and can probably be downgraded to T.(T)

The NJ population has been slow to increase and was ~30 pairs in 2016. New pairs have been mostly in urban areas on buildings and bridges, and the north Jersey cliff and urban habitats benefit from a thriving NY City population. All surrounding states list PEFA as E, and NH-VT list as T. It's stable at this low level as long as nest site management continues. (T)

Still very few nests (30 active as of 2016). Several nest sites require active management.(E)

I just can't see justification for giving this species more than Threatened status. There are probably more Peregrine nests in the state than historically ever existed and many are in coastal sights where they shouldn't be encouraged to nest.(T)

I echo this panelists comment: There are more nesting Peregrines in the State than probably any time in history. I see know reason why they should still be considered endangered. Perhaps even Threatened is a bit much.(T)

Still a small, sensitive population, dependent on human intervention.(E)

Currently listed as E but increase in population warrants downlisting to T. (T)

I believe it requires significant effort to keep PEFA as a breeding bird in NJ.(E)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

This is a tricky one, as Peregrines didn't historically nest on the coastal plain, and currently the breeders there are at cross-purposes with other T&E beach nesters which are regionally or globally threatened. I've read that the fledgling rate of urban Peregrines is much higher than the "wild" ones, so perhaps keeping the bird at T would be a good compromise. (T)

The species is doing very well in NJ and regionally. (S/S)

Doing well, but population is still small. Increasing regional trend - could possibly warrant down-listing to T(E)

After huge declines during the DDT era, this species made a big upswing in the mid-Atlantic and Northeast as a breeding species. Given their success relative to coastal birds in trouble such as Piping Plover and Least Tern, I suspect this species doesn't need heightened status anymore. Possibly a candidate for SC but not T or E. I would go further and suggest that if we rank Peregrine Falcon as endangered in 2016 given the huge gains during the recovery, we need to VERY seriously assess other non-raptor landbirds that have received far less attention from this ranking process, historically. (SC)

Peregrines away from the Palisades should no longer be promoted and considered strongly as part of any type of native population. Hacked birds have had their own difficulty in the native habitats. But I can now see the good argument for E because that original population (again, habitat-limited) was always small and potentially sensitive. This kind of reasoning has native habitats in mind first and foremost. I appreciate that is very difficult to know exactly what native habitat should be defined as anymore. (E)

Peregrine Falcon has been on the state endangered species list for more than 50 years. Although the current population appears to be stable, it is very small (fewer than 25 pairs? and still vulnerable to environmental contaminants and human disturbance. (E)

There are more nesting Peregrines in the State than probably any time in history. I see no reason why they should still be considered endangered. Perhaps even Threatened is a bit much. (T)

We should keep it's current status. (E)

If nesting programs ceased would we be surprised to see PEFA go extinct in the state after several years? I wouldn't be. (E)

Population is increasing so no longer threatened with extirpation, but population is still small in NJ and nests need active protection to keep the population increasing in NJ(T)

The low number of nesting pairs, dangers associated with nesting in urban areas, and need for management are all factors to consider. (E)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Always has been a low-density breeder. (E)

After huge declines during the DDT era, this species is on a big upswing in the mid-Atlantic and Northeast as a breeding species. Given their success relative to coastal birds in trouble such as Piping Plover and Least Tern, I suspect this species doesn't need heightened status anymore. Possibly a candidate for SC but not T or E. (S/S)

I think PEFA have recovered well, though it's hard to decide what would bring them down from endangered to threatened. This would warrant a larger discussion. (T)

Currently endangered. Nesting only in very specific locations. (E)

population and fecundity are increasing but population size is small and there are still moderate threats to the breeding population. (T)

Population low enough to merit E. But this is a funny one because I don't think PEFA should at all be encouraged or supported to nest in the Coastal Plain Region since there is no proof that they ever nested there before human intervention. Top predators are well-known to science to be able to significantly and quickly affect specific prey populations. I definitely love the bird, but I would like to see them be stopped as a coastal breeder, and would only like to support E status if they are no longer managed in that bio-region in the breeding season. Also the intergrading population to form the NJ stock is a concern with regards to their migratory, territorial, and hunting behaviors. (E)

Peregrine Falcon has been on the state endangered species list for more than 50 years. Although the current population appears to be stable, it is very small (fewer than 25 pairs? and still vulnerable to environmental contaminants and human disturbance. (E)

According to the ENSP report the number of nests in the state in 2015 was still only 32. (E)

This species historically nested only in the cliffs of Palisades and Delaware River and numbered approx. 12 pairs. Prior to the DDT decline PEFA began nesting on "skyscrapers" in cities like Toronto. Their restoration in the East relied on man-made structures, and the NJ pop (like most of the eastern pop.) remains most abundant and successful on these structures. PEFA began recolonizing NJ cliffs in 2003, and there are max. ~5 territories occupied there, but nest success is generally lower than on buildings/towers and bridges. Causes of mortality are impacts to windows and wires, and nestlings/fledglings are to GHOW. Contaminants remain a threat; ex: flame retardant chemicals have been found in highest levels in PEFA, with unknown effects. The success of ~30 current nesting pairs is fairly dependent on proper management and avoiding disturbance during nesting season. (T)

Peregrine Falcon (*Falco peregrinus*) / Non-Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 4 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	13	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			7.0	4.9			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Increases suggest that the non-breeding status should be lower than SC.(S/S)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Currently listed as SC and comments suggest not enough data support delisting. (SC)

Significant increase in 2nd NY Breeding Bird Atlas, so it may be doing better in the region.(S/S)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Hawkwatch numbers are steady (and much higher than they were 40 years ago). Many/ most of the birds seen during migration are coming from outside of the NJ breeding population, too.(S/S)

This species could perfectly tow the line between SC and S/S for a long-ranging raptor. Conservative with SC(SC)

Wintering population increasing but still has moderate threats to non-breeding population(SC)

I'm on the fence between S and SC but think the SC is warranted for the present.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Counts at hawk watches have improved.(SC)

There is a regional comeback but numbers could still be low. I support leaving it as SC. (SC)

The breeding birds are resident and subject to the same issues as in the nesting season. Peregrine Falcon is now a common migrant, mainly along the coast, especially in fall. Wintering numbers, as indicated by CBC data, increased rapidly during the 1980's and 1990's, but appear to have leveled off in recent years.(SC)

Cape May Hawk Watch totals have remained fairly steady for the past 15 years and are up from the 1980's.(SC)

The non-breeding population includes mainly-resident breeding adults, in addition to the influx of migrant PEFA, some of which remain in NJ in winter, though most migrate through along the coast. Hatching-year PEFA tend to migrate south as well (some are trapped each yr in Cape May), including juveniles from surrounding states where PEFA remain listed species.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Olive-sided Flycatcher (*Contopus cooperi*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Not Applicable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	0	0	1	10
Avg. CONF			4.0				6.6

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No recent breeding. Also extirpated as a breeder in PA, though there are a few summer records of singing males there in recent years (one near the NJ border).(N/A)

Species doesn't nest in NJ. (N/A)

Olive-sided Flycatcher has nested in the Catskills, but is unlikely to extend its breeding range into NJ.(N/A)

I have never heard of them breeding in NJ.(N/A)

Olive-sided Flycatcher (*Contopus cooperi*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 4 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	13	1	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	4.0			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Population decline warrants SC status.(SC)

Fast declining across the region, so special concern is justified, but since it's habitat as a migrant is ill-defined and it passes through the state quickly I'm not sure what help it will do.(SC)

Big declines merit attention to those that pass through NJ.(SC)

An uncommon passage migrant through NJ, but drastic declines on breeding grounds.(SC)

I think the only thing we could do regarding conservation management of this species is at a broad aspect in terms of stewardship of migratory hotspots/larger tracts of forests where this species occurs in migration.(SC)

Apparent declines and PIF Yellow status.(SC)

Steep regional declines and PIF Yellow Watch List species (PIF 2016). We should at least try to monitor them, and with the new geolocators this could be feasible(SC)

Declining.(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

PIF Yellow Watch List species (PIF 2016).(SC)

Dramatic declines of world population.(SC)

Continental declines but not a species common to NJ.(SC)

The dramatic population decline in recent decades show that this is definitely a species of special concern. Not sure what could be done to improve its prospects in NJ, however.(SC)

Massive decline in most of breeding range suggest something outside of breeding season is happening.(SC)

Steep regional declines and PIF Yellow Watch List species (PIF 2016). We should at least try to monitor them, and with the new geolocators this could be feasible.(SC)

The Rund 1 and 2 comments convince me that the population should be monitored.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

World population declines for this species are dramatic, but I can't think of anything specific that we could do for OSFL migrants in NJ. (SC)

Given how scarce the species is during migration, not sure what NJ should be doing toward conservation of OSFL.(N/A)

Large decline on regional level(SC)

Steep regional declines and PIF Yellow Watch List species (PIF 2016).(SC)

I agree that it is tough to imagine management that would have a direct impact on this species, but it has declined tremendously (<http://ebird.org/content/pa/news/olive-sided-flycatcher-peregrine-of-the-flycatchers>) and I think it is an important flagship for passerines. If a migrant/ wintering raptor had declined 74%, it probably would have been listed as an endangered species in the state in past years.(SC)

SC for regional troubles.(S/S)

Big declines in breeding grounds to the north merit attention when they pass through NJ during migration.(SC)

Threats to the population include changing forest conditions, tropical deforestation, and climate change. (SC)

The Round 1 comments regarding the population loss leads me to vote SC. The 2nd NY breeding bird atlas showed a 34% decline.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species has suffered a huge decline (74% decline 1966-2005) across its range (<http://ebird.org/content/pa/news/olive-sided-flycatcher-peregrine-of-the-flycatchers/>) and occurs in NJ just as a migrant.(SC)

The population is declining and, according to the 2016 PIF continental plan, the non-breeding population has high threats. 78% of the population has already been lost and if the trend continues, the current population will be cut in half in 24 years. It is on the 2016 PIF yellow watch list for declining species(SC)

Regional decline looks to be enough to warrant SC status. (SC)

Olive-sided Flycatcher is an uncommon spring and fall migrant through NJ. Population declines have been noted across its entire breeding range. Losses probably due in part to deforestation of its winter habitat in the Andes. It is hard to imagine anything that could be done in New Jersey to have a significant impact on this species.(U/U)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Eastern Wood-Pewee (*Contopus virens*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	11	0	1	0
Avg. CONF				6.1			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Eastern Wood-Pewee (*Contopus virens*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	11	0	0	1
Avg. CONF				6.0			5.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Yellow-bellied Flycatcher (*Empidonax flaviventris*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Not Applicable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	1	0	1	10
Avg. CONF				5.0			6.7

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Not currently known to breed in NJ.(N/A)

Does not nest in NJ. (N/A)

Yellow-bellied Flycatcher nests in small numbers in the Catskills, but is unlikely to extend its breeding range into NJ.(N/A)

This species does not breed in NJ.(N/A)

Yellow-bellied Flycatcher (*Empidonax flaviventris*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.4			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Agree on ID issues. 2nd NY and Ontario BBAs show significant increases.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Status is a bit clouded by ID issues (confusion with other Empidonax and wood-pewees is VERY common among the birding community).(S/S)

An uncommon and seldom detected migrant. Breeding bird surveys to the north of NJ show this species doing well and increasing.(S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Acadian Flycatcher (*Empidonax virescens*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	11	0	1	0
Avg. CONF				5.7			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Increasing in BBS data. Increasing in north NJ and stable in south NJ. (S/S)

This species has increased significantly as a breeding bird in NJ over the past fifty years. Now nests in many parts of the state in a variety of habitats, usually near water. (S/S)

Acadian Flycatcher (*Empidonax virescens*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	13	1	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.6			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Rarely and conclusively identified as a migrant in NJ, especially in southbound migration.(U/U)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Seldom detected away from the breeding grounds.(S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Willow Flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	10	0	2	0
Avg. CONF				6.1			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Breeding bird data show that this species has increased significantly over the past several decades. (S/S)

Willow Flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	10	0	1	1
Avg. CONF				5.9			5.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

One of the more frequently encountered Empidonax in migration, but difficult to determine status.(S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Least Flycatcher (*Empidonax minimus*) / Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	14	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.5				

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Long-term declines regionally. Nests mostly in NW quadrant of state. Likely threats include forest degradation (overabundant deer, invasive species, climate change).(SC)

Listed by PIF as a common bird in steep decline, we have seen a historic decline based on BBS data, although leveling out over the last decade. (SC)

Regional declines and habitat concerns seem to make a case for SC(SC)

Negative BBS trend. Declining regional trend, and Common Bird in Steep Decline (PIF 2016).(SC)

Multiple regionwide declines suggest that we should treat it as SC.(SC)

Nests only in the northwestern corner of the state, where breeding bird data shows a long-term decline. Climate change may affect this species continuing presence as a breeder in NJ.(SC)

Only found in the Northern part of the state and has been declining for years(SC)

Declining breeder in the northern part of the state. (SC)

Consistent declines, and dependence on large tracts of somewhat specialized habitat during nesting.(SC)

Already listed as SC, listed as a common bird of steep declines (43% of population already lost and current population has a half life of 42 years, PIF 2016), and continued declines do not warrant de-listing. Only locally abundant in northern NJ where shrubby openings in occur in large forest tracts.(SC)

Habitat loss & regional decline are concerns.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

BBS, PIF and 2nd NY and PA BBAs indicate decline.(SC)

Substantial declines in NJ and regional BBS data. Mostly a mature forest breeding species.(SC)

Very localized breeder. (SC)

still abundant, but population is declining in NJ and the region and breeding population has moderate threats (PIF 2016)(SC)

A declining species on BBS. I could estimate about 300-700 pairs in state. But in NJ tied to Piedmont or higher region mostly mid-successional Forest, not fully mature forest. So it's also a habitat thing. (SC)

Nests only in the northwestern corner of the state, where breeding bird data shows a long-term decline. Climate change may affect this species continuing presence as a breeder in NJ.(SC)

seems to be declining across the region including the limited part of NJ in which this species breeds. (SC)

The 2nd NY Breeding Bird Atlas showed a slight decline from the first. Indications are that it is declining in NJ as well.(SC)

The occurrence data in the NJ map is likely a reflection of surveys conducted in the 1990s and 2000s (and not resurveyed).(N/O)

Least Flycatcher (*Empidonax minimus*) / Non-Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	10	0	1	1
Avg. CONF				5.2			5.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Status clouded by ID issues with other Empidonax flycatchers.(S/S)

The most commonly encountered Empidonax in migration. (S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Great Crested Flycatcher (*Myiarchus crinitus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	11	0	1	0
Avg. CONF				6.6			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Common and increasing throughout the state.(S/S)

Great Crested Flycatcher (*Myiarchus crinitus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	11	0	0	1
Avg. CONF				6.5			5.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Eastern Kingbird (*Tyrannus tyrannus*) / Breeding Status

☒ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	5.3			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Trustworthy negative trend, should be easily detected, and should be pretty common, it seems.(SC)

We still need to keep our eye on this species, but perhaps the high population abundance and wide distribution do not warrant listing even with the declines. (S/S)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Negative BBS trend; declining regional trend (PIF 2016)(SC)

The steep declines in the available BBS data suggest we need to rank this species as SC.(SC)

Personal observations suggest this species is uncommon but stable, but BBS data tell another story. Range-wide the species is increasing in some states and decreasing in others. What's going on in NJ? Deserves attention.(SC)

During the 2nd NY and PA BBAs, reported in 70% and 83% of blocks, respectively. Less confirmed blocks, -10% and -13% since 1980s.(S/S)

We should keep track of this species.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Still quite a common bird, but substantial declines in both NJ and regional BBS data.(SC)

population is still abundant but is declining in NJ and the region. According to 2016 PIF plan, 38% of population has already been lost, but it will take over 50 years to cut the current population in half. the breeding population has moderate threats. We need to keep our eye on this species. (SC)

Breeding bird data show an alarming downward trend over multiple decades. This is likely related to habitat loss, but bears watching.(SC)

Eastern Kingbird (*Tyrannus tyrannus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☒ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	10	0	1	1
Avg. CONF				5.8			5.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Abundant migrant(S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Loggerhead Shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Not Applicable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	1	0	0	0	0	2	9
Avg. CONF	8.0						6.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Does not currently breed in NJ and can be considered casual at present.(N/A)

Atlas cites doubts about historical breeding status. Not a bird likely to breed in NJ again without natural colonization somehow. (N/A)

Loggerhead Shrike apparently never nested in NJ and with the current retraction of the breeding range it is unlikely that they will in the foreseeable future.(N/A)

If there was an "extirpated" list, this species would be a candidate.(E)

Loggerhead Shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Not Applicable

Summary of Round 4 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	2	0	0	0	0	0	12
Avg. CONF	5.0						5.4

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Peripheral species with no annual pattern of occurrence here now.(N/A)

I don't understand how rarity/few sightings are a reason not to list as E. Doesn't that argue for E? We're not talking about a penguin.(E)

Agree that this species is sadly "just a vagrant" to NJ during non-breeding season. Don't see how we could manage for this species.(N/A)

Currently listed as E and data do not support the species is extirpated from migrating through NJ.(E)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Currently listed as E and data do not support the species is extirpated from migrating through NJ. (E)

Seems to be gone from NJ.(E)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Not really a wintering species in the state and no likely management could be done for this species in migrant (when it is also very rare).(N/A)

This species is sadly just a vagrant in NJ and does not occur regularly. Ranking it as endangered would probably be a misstep.(N/A)

I think it's rarity and that there are effectively very few remaining regional breeders to migrate/vagrate to NJ is leading to S/S and not E in this case(S/S)

Once a fairly common early spring and early fall migrant, Loggerhead Shrike has been recorded in the state only 4 times in the past ten years. The last CBC record was in 2007.(E)

As a rare migrant in the past decade I'm unsure if this species qualifies for any status.(U/U)

If we're going to say they should be here in the winter or during migration, then they should be considered endangered due to range-wide declines and low numbers in NJ. But historically this species depends on agricultural practices to expand its range, and may have been rare or absent from NJ before the late 1800s.(E)

Nearly extirpated from the Northeast. The few breeding individuals in RI, ME, and Canada most likely stop over in NJ. (E)

Not recorded annually anymore.(E)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

The "Migrant Shrike" no longer occurs regularly in NJ.(N/A)

Decline in CBC and throughout region with moderate threats to non-breeding populations (PIF 2016). Non-breeding population is close to being extirpated in NJ. (E)

Only occurs in NJ (and most of the region) occasionally, less than annually. (S/S)

Once a fairly common early spring and early fall migrant, Loggerhead Shrike has been recorded in the state only 4 times in the past ten years.

The last CBC record was in 2007. (E)

dangerously low population.(E)

I haven't seen one for many years.(E)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Yellow-throated Vireo (*Vireo flavifrons*) / Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	11	0	1	0
Avg. CONF				5.9			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Atlas and BBS data show little decline, and southern range has increased. (S/S)

Yellow-throated Vireo (*Vireo flavifrons*) / Non-Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	11	0	0	1
Avg. CONF				5.6			5.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Blue-headed Vireo (*Vireo solitarius*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	2	11	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			7.0	4.9			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

My experience is that this bird is largely tied to hemlock groves in the highlands and ridge/valley sections of the state. Continued loss of healthy hemlock stands by the wooly adelgid could mean that NJ loses this species as a breeder. It's possible that Blue-headed Vireo can use Norway Spruce groves as a substitute, where I still find them in the High Point/Stokes SF complex. (T)

BBS data show small increase, regional population also increasing (PIF 2016)(S/S)

Fits SC very well considering population and fairly restricted area of habitat(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Uncommon, localized breeder. (SC)

population is increasing in NJ. moderately low threats to breeding population, and regional population more than doubled (PIF 2016)(S/S)

BBS and Atlas probably show small increases but low numbers to begin with and probably due to habitat. Really likes to nest with mixture of hemlocks or other conifers in its territory. I might estimate NJ population at 100-500 pairs. But like SC because habitat is limited and likely to remain that way. (SC)

Blue-headed Vireo (*Vireo solitarius*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	10	0	1	1
Avg. CONF				5.8			5.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Horned Lark (*Eremophila alpestris*) / Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Threatened

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	12	1	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		5.2	4.0				

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

T status mostly because of status on native dune habitats and not their regular occurrence in low numbers on NJ's airports, sod farms, and some managed grasslands. (T)

Habitat loss will only continue. T status should bring more attention to this species.(T)

Outside of airports/military installations, unsure how much can be done in terms of managing for this species. But faces hazards at pretty much all breeding sites. (T)

Limited habitat, no evidence to down list from current T status(T)

Localized breeder in dry grasslands and sod farms. Habitat used by HOLA is also worth protecting for other grassland species and migratory shorebirds including Upland Sandpiper.(T)

Noting its dependence on a largely by-gone landscape, and peripherality to NJ.(SC)

Very local breeders; dependent on declining grassland habitat.(T)

Should remain T based on limited and declining habitat.(T)

No data to support changing status from Threatened. Habitat loss is still a big issue as it is for all grassland species in NJ.(T)

Same opinion as in Round 1. Horned Lark formerly common breeder along coastal beaches, but gone because of development and disturbance. Changes in agriculture practices and reversion of farmland to woodland major threat elsewhere. Airports are now major strongholds.(T)

Population not doing better than it was when it was listed as T, no justification for down-listing.(T)

Currently listed as threatened. Continued declines do not warrant downlisting to SC(T)

I'm not all that familiar with this bird, but I'm changing from SC to T based on the comments so far.(T)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

A grassland species that likes disturbed habitat. I don't think we'll ever see this species breeding again along the coast, making protection of remaining nesting areas inland more important. It still breeds on sod farms in central/south jersey (pers comm). Habitat used by HOLA in the breeding season is also generally suitable for nesting Vesper Sparrow, another species of concern.(T)

Restricted to heavily managed landscapes where once bred more widespread including coastal dunes. Management for HOLA would also benefit other grassland/open land species of concern.(T)

Again, breeding confined to airports and agricultural areas for the most part; both of these come with some risks in terms of habitat management and disturbance.(SC)

Limited breeding in NJ. Steep regional declines, and Common Bird in Steep Decline (PIF 2016)(T)

This is a species that was likely absent or rare in NJ due to habitat availability pre-colonization. It exists now as a breeder primarily on agricultural lands and airfields, but is a peripheral breeder in NJ to begin with. I'd be comfortable with SC but probably not T ranking for this bird that has a huge (safe) population elsewhere in North America.(SC)

I go from SC to T to favor the loss of the littoral habitats that it once natively preferred. (T)

Horned Lark formerly common breeder along coastal beaches, but gone because of development and disturbance. Changes in agriculture practices and reversion of farmland to woodland major threat elsewhere. Airports are now major strongholds.(T)

Keep this species listed as Threatened. It's situation hasn't changed much in the last 10 years.(T)

We should keep it's current status.(T)

Only local breeding populations.(T)

Currently listed as threatened and still declining - de-listing or moving to SC not warranted. (T)

Habitat is somewhat ephemeral except at airports and there are hazard associated with those.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Breeding confined to airports and agricultural areas for the most part; both of these come with some risks in terms of habitat management and disturbance. (SC)

NJ eBird data from last 10 springs suggests range contraction since BBA in 1990's. Seems to be only a handful of reliable locations.(T)

Currently threatened. Localized breeding. (T)

Population declining and not widespread in NJ. Widespread throughout region but in steep decline; 65% of regional population has already been lost and, if trends continue, the current population will be cut in half in 40 years (PIF 2016) (T)

This is a tough one as most of them are now found on airports and anything similar. They also like big fields and larger dune systems for nesting. Small population could trigger T consideration but I like SC because of fairly limited habitat. It would be good to see many more dune systems be allowed to cycle naturally and the lack of that is probably why they have been declining from that habitat regionally since the 1940's. (SC)

Horned Lark formerly common breeder along coastal beaches, but gone because of development and disturbance. Changes in agriculture practices and reversion of farmland to woodland major threat elsewhere. (T)

Their habitat is shrinking and they are scarce and local during the breeding season.(T)

Horned Lark (*Eremophila alpestris*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Special Concern**

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	11	2	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.1	4.5			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Eastern declines during CBCs continue.(SC)

Uses same habitats in non-breeding seasons, worth protecting.(SC)

declines on NJ CBC. Wintering habitat restricted.(SC)

Decrease in habitat, but not under the same pressures as during the breeding season.(SC)

Depends on many of the same sites and habitats in nonbreeding season as it does during breeding season.(SC)

CBC numbers declining, uses similar habitat as breeding season.(SC)

Currently listed as SC. Declines do not warrant delisting. (SC)

Apparently still declining.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

declines in CBC occurrences and limited habitat support SC status.(SC)

Regional declines (PIF 2016)(SC)

In many cases, uses similar habitat in breeding and nonbreeding seasons. Similar ranking seems justified, so I'll go with SC.(SC)

Regional declines and loss of native habitats (though mostly littoral)(SC)

Depends on similar habitats as breeding season.(SC)

population declining throughout range. (SC)

Declining in NJ and in the region. 37% decline on 2nd NY atlas.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Non-breeding population more common, but less suitable habitat now than in the past. (SC)

CBC in NJ has also shown declines (SC)

Regional declines support a SC status. (SC)

Breeding populations in northeast all apparently down. Migrant and wintering populations fluctuate widely and don't provide much evidence, but loss of habitat still a factor.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Purple Martin (*Progne subis*) / Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	13	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.2				

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

PUMA is a good candidate for nest box support. SC(SC)

Modifications from and dependence on humans adds some risk to this species. Worth at least some awareness. (SC)

Regional declines, necessity of human help (landlords) for breeding success.(SC)

Regional declines; restricted and human-required breeding sites.(SC)

Any species depending on humans for its survival probably deserves SC status as we're notoriously "2"(SC)

Agree with this comment: Breeding bird data show long-term decline in abundance. Sensitivity to late spring weather phenomena and dependence on artificial nest sites makes the species vulnerable(SC)

Depends on people for most nesting, due to invasive competitors and loss of habitat.(SC)

Population declines and comments support SC listing. (SC)

All indications are that the population needs to be monitored.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

This is a species that depends on humans for nesting habitat in NJ. The population will largely depend on how many dedicated martin landlords are active in the state. (SC)

Regional declines and dependence on human nesting habitat warrant SC status.(SC)

Population declining in NJ and regionally(SC)

Steep declines demand ranking of at least SC.(SC)

Needs some support in NJ and regionally.(SC)

Breeding bird data show long-term decline in abundance. Sensitivity to late spring weather phenomena and dependence on artificial nest sites makes the species vulnerable.(SC)

Has gone extinct locally and, with introduction of starlings and house sparrows, and removal of snags, is now almost completely dependent on nest boxes. High-profile successful nest box programs could give the impression that this species is doing OK, but the major continuing decline is evident in the BBS data. (SC)

We need to monitor this species. (SC)

A focused nest box placement scheme in the right habitat might be helpful.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

2nd NY and PA BBAs show 39% and 44% less blocks reporting this species compared to 1980s.(U/U)

This steeply declining species deserves an elevated status.(SC)

Population declining in NJ and in region. 23% of regional population has already been lost but it will take over 50 years for the current population to be cut in half if trends continue (PIF 2016)(SC)

This is tough. They pretty much only nest in man-made structures now. That also means they do not nest in natural cavities (Birds of NJ-- the Atlas) pretty much in NJ. I could easily see SC because of this. (S/S)

Breeding bird data show long-term decline in abundance. Sensitivity to late spring weather phenomena and dependence on artificial nest sites makes the species vulnerable. (SC)

BBS data shows that the decline is continuing.(SC)

Purple Martin (*Progne subis*) / Non-Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	2	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			4.0	5.3			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Protection of post-breeding roost sites is important.(SC)

Large roosting population stages in the southern part of the state prior to southbound migration.(SC)

I chose S/S but right on the border for SC(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No great estimates out there but Maurice River roost in August could have up to 25% of the eastern subspecies in some years. This could be a consideration for SC. (S/S)

Not very common during migration.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Cliff Swallow (*Pterochelidon pyrrhonota*) / Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Special Concern**

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	13	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.3				

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Another species that could be helped with concerted efforts in next boxes under bridges.(SC)
Seems stable but local, and generally low-density as breeding bird. Seems deserving of SC status(SC)
Keep on SC list due to limited number of man-made nesting locations.(SC)
stable at the regional level and increasing...hope to move this to SS eventually but still SC for the small breeding area.(SC)
Very local breeder and vulnerable(SC)
Doing much better than 30 years ago, but still small overall population and easily disrupted.(SC)
Small number of breeding colonies in NJ, benefits from attention.(SC)
Currently listed as SC. Even though the population is increasing, concerns over nest sites and comments submitted warrant keeping that status. (SC)
On the fence between SC and S.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Overall population is likely stable, but is localized in NJ to the Delaware River Valley, where it uses bridges. May still be present in small numbers as a nester in Sussex County in barns/ag buildings.(SC)
showing a comeback after a long decline.(S/S)
Peripheral species, hugely common across northern and western North America but has declined regionally.(SC)
Went from S/S to SC because it is local and often in man-made structures, needs support in NJ and regionally.(SC)
vulnerable due to nesting in only a few isolated colonies within the state.(SC)
Breeding population not particularly high in the state, but seems to have stabilized thanks to bridge nesting habits.(SC)
I think with some simple conservation efforts, we can help this population recover. Man made ceramic bowls have helped them drastically in other areas.(SC)
Though they nest in colonies they're very tolerant of human activity (unless that activity destroys/blocks the nest sites, of course). Increasing pretty steadily for 15 years.(SC)
Population increasing in region and NJ. Some nests found in urban areas under large concrete awnings. (S/S)
Future looks to be brightening, but I think it should be SC for now.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Only a handful of known nesting locations in NJ.(SC)
Peripheral species, hugely common across northern and western North America but has declined regionally.(SC)
Very uncommon and local breeder.(SC)
Another tough one thanks to bridge culverts. That's mostly where they nest in NJ. Small numbers and in decline but pretty much colonized its way through much of the east through culverts. (S/S)
Cliff Swallow numbers have not recovered from the dramatic decline in the early and mid-20th century, but seem to be slowly expanding their presence as a breeding species in NJ. Competition with House Sparrows still a major problem. Tend to nest in sizable colonies, which makes them vulnerable to disturbance.(SC)
vulnerable due to nesting in only a few isolated colonies within the state.(T)
BBS data indicate that they are increasing. if this continues, I would change the assessment to stable.(SC)

Cliff Swallow (*Pterochelidon pyrrhonota*) / Non-Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.5			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

population increasing(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Not encountered very often during migration.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Winter Wren (*Troglodytes hiemalis*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	12	2	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			4.9	6.0			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

I don't hear about this species as a breeder as much as I used to. Presumably this bird is susceptible to habitat loss and forest health issues in its limited breeding range in the NJ highlands.(SC)

Limited habitat; more work needed(SC)

I'm pleased to vote to afford this species state ranking as SC, but it is certainly a peripheral species that is still quite common in a belt across the southern boreal/ montane forest.(SC)

Small numbers push it to at least SC(SC)

Winter Wren is pretty marginal as a breeding bird in NJ, but its dependence on old-growth forest for nesting merits close monitoring. Breeding bird data does not indicate decline.(SC)

Never a common breeding bird in the state and never will be. Numbers seem stable, but low.(SC)

Hard to express what conservation efforts can be taken, but attention should be had.(SC)

Depends on old-growth with other specialized habitat characteristics (not well understood, perhaps), and has a small population with a limited range in the state.(SC)

Population increasing in NJ and region-wide. (S/S)

Agree that the range and habitat is limited in the state.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Range-restricted primarily to the Kittatinny Ridge and Valley and Highlands. 2nd NY and PA BBAs show significant increases since 1980s.(SC)

Basically a peripheral species.(S/S)

Very low number specialty breeder of northern NJ, a closer examination of their population should be discussed.(SC)

regional population increasing but still has moderate threats to breeding population (PIF 2016)(SC)

BBS and Atlas probably show small increases but low numbers to begin with and probably due to habitat. Nests around conifers with dense shrubbery. I might estimate NJ population at 100-500 pairs. I like SC because habitat is limited and likely to remain that way. (SC)

Winter Wren is pretty marginal as a breeding bird in NJ, but its dependence on old-growth forest for nesting merits close monitoring. Breeding bird data does not indicate decline.(SC)

There is a very small breeding population in the state and it seems that most of the state is not appropriate for this wren.(SC)

Winter Wren (*Troglodytes hiemalis*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	10	0	1	0
Avg. CONF			6.0	5.3			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Regional declines support a SC status. (SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Sedge Wren (*Cistothorus platensis*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Endangered

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	12	0	1	0	1	0	0
Avg. CONF	6.0		6.0		4.0		

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Formerly bred in coastal marshes, now only attempts second nesting in NJ when conditions in the mid-west/prairies are dry. NJ is an outlier population at best.(SC)

Very scarce to non-breeder in modern time. Primary breeding range in the midwestern US.(E)

Difficult to detect and seems to be easily affected by habitat changes. Concern species on a regional level.(E)

Sporadic and rare breeder(E)

I'll change my vote to undetermined/ unknown - I was surprised to see so much of the panel voting for E status on this review. I wasn't aware of recent breeding activity from the species. The only suggestion of breeding activity in the eBird database from the past 5 years was of a single bird at Tuckahoe present for about 2 weeks in July 2012. Does anyone have other data that confirms that this bird actually does regularly breed in NJ now? If not, I think ranking it as Endangered wouldn't be the right step. This species is peripheral in NJ in modern times, anyway. Overall, the species is doing well in the USA - from the BNA account: "BBS data indicate that Sedge Wren populations trends were generally positive in North America from 1966 to 1996, mostly as a result of relatively recent population increases in the Great Plains (Peterjohn and Sauer 1999)." This, despite declines in the eastern part of its range.(U/U)

Looks to be barely hanging on or not a regular breeder.(E)

Sedge Wren was essentially wiped out as a breeding species by the end of the 20th century, with greatest declines coinciding with loss of habitat to ditching and draining in mid-century. At present, no sizable nesting populations anywhere near NJ, so return of the species as a regular breeder not likely(E)

Breeding records in the state are few and far between, Specialized habitat still shrinking.(E)

We should keep current status.(E)

Should be easily picked up throughout breeding season due to high rate of loud singing throughout the day, but limited to a rare habitat type.(E)

Population stable or increasing throughout region except NJ. Still a handful of nesting locations in NJ but may become extirpated esp. as we lose more habitat to Phrag and sea level rise. (E)

The population is so low that it could disappear for good within a few years as a breeding bird.(E)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Habitat loss and modification, especially in coastal areas, seems to be a problem here. But also a secretive bird. A 2nd breeding bird atlas would be most helpful in acquiring more up to date info. But certainly a species that seems to essentially be extirpated.(E)

Very few recent breeding records. Does not seem to occur at locations in consecutive years.(E)

Not known to breed regularly in NJ now.(N/A)

Personal observation has seen this bird drop out from a scarce breeder. There is however a uncommon population along the Delaware bayshore.(T)

Sporadic, rare breeder. (E)

very low population numbers and moderate threats breeding (PIF 2016). If not addressed may become extirpated.(E)

Very rare or rare and hard to detect ephemeral and nomadic breeder. Keep E status. (E)

Sedge Wren was essentially wiped out as a breeding species by the end of the 20th century, with greatest declines coinciding with loss of habitat to ditching and draining in mid-century. At present, no sizable nesting populations anywhere near NJ, so return of the species as a regular breeder not likely.(E)

habitat specialist, very rare nester in the state.(E)

All indications are that it is very scarce. Even though it is secretive I don't think that many are overlooked.(E)

Sedge Wren (*Cistothorus platensis*) / Non-Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Endangered

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	12	0	1	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF	5.0		4.0				

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

E status should be kept year round. Sensitive species along coastal marshes in winter.(E)

E seems justified based on low density regionally and (emerging?) importance of Delaware Bay marshes in winter(E)

Keep endangered status; probably under-detected as a migrant and during winter in south jersey, where it is rare-but regular wintering species. (E)

scarce migrant and winter resident.(E)

Perhaps a special concern migrant, but the majority overwinter well south of NJ.(SC)

Certainly rare enough as a wintering species or a migrant to warrant Endangered status the same as it does as a breeder.(E)

Same threats apply as to breeding season.(E)

Not convinced that it shouldn't be listed as E due to a lack of data or lack of a clear plan to manage it.(E)

Currently listed as endangered and declines do not warrant downlisting. (E)

Extremely rare even as a non-breeder.(E)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

A secretive species that's probably under-detected in coastal marshes during winter. (U/U)

A rare visitor during migration. Unclear what management action would favor increasing the non-breeding individuals, therefore I don't see a reason to list at T or E.(SC)

Concerns for upper marsh habitats along both coasts, where species seems to be found most frequently in winter. (SC)

SC might be appropriate to recognize the winter status of this species on the Delaware Bayshore, the only area where it can be truly considered as regular in NJ at the moment.(SC)

Very small numbers regionally(E)

CBC data show big declines (along with significant reduction of favored habitat) support keeping the E status(E)

Scarce migrant and wintering.(E)

We should keep current status.(E)

Should winter along southern coast but wetlands limited and threatened by development.(E)

Currently listed as endangered. Winter in NJ in higher numbers but very few breed in Northeast and may become extirpated. (E)

Very few records on ebird in the past 10 years.(E)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Apparently appears at some sites along Delaware Bayshore and Atlantic Coast in winter with regularity. But these are few and far between, and also subject to changes via sea level rise. (E)

More non-breeding records, but still scarce.(E)

This is a rare but regular migrant and wintering bird, especially in the Delaware Bayshore marshes.(SC)

An uncommon bird in the winter along the delaware bayshore, this bird should still be protected on it's wintering grounds here.(SC)

Currently endangered. (E)

very low population numbers and moderate non-breeding threats (PIF 2016), but increasing in region. (SC)

CBC data show big declines (along with significant reduction of favored habitat) support keeping the E status. (E)

Very scarce in migration and in winter, although difficult to detect. Usually only a few on CBC's.(E)

In more than 40 years of birding in NJ I have never seen one.(E)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Marsh Wren (*Cistothorus palustris*) / Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Not Reached**

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	5	9	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			4.8	5.1			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Agree with other SC comments.(SC)

Big declines, threatened habitat.(SC)

I'll stick with SC for this species as it has likely declined as a breeder inland; though it's still relatively common and tolerant of phragmites wetlands along the coast.(SC)

Despite the overall population increase, it seems to be in trouble in NJ. The numbers remained stable on 2nd NY atlas.(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Still fairly common in larger coastal wetlands, I'm unsure of its status/trends at the few remaining large freshwater marshes in north jersey.

Threatened by wetland degradation, sea level rise.(SC)

saltwater intrusion, SLR, marsh subsidence, threats to fw marshes all conspiring against this species. Regional declines support the status(SC)

EBird data from the last 10 Junes suggests range is unchanged since the NJ BBA in the 1990s despite the decreases indicated in the BBS.

(S/S)

Has declined significantly as a breeder in suitable habitats.(SC)

Declining trend, depends on uncommon and threatened habitat. Should be at least SC.(SC)

Population does face threats and is declining in some states in the East, but is increasing everywhere else. According to PIF the population of marsh wrens has increased by 168%. Abundant in freshwater marshes. Not sure it warrants SC status right now. If it does, we should also consider eastern kingbird as sc .(S/S)

Not always found even in places like the Great Swamp.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Declines regionally and locally warrant action to prevent T or E status down the road.(SC)

Common in some areas, but declining BBS trend and significant habitat threats. (SC)

A freshwater species that deserves elevated status, probably due to declines in freshwater/ mildly brackish wetland habitat.(SC)

Needs to be monitored but still 1000s of breeders(S/S)

Breeding bird data show long-term serious decline, a trend also noted by birders. Not sure of cause, as they seem to be hard to find in places that have not undergone any noticeable change.(SC)

Agree, this species is susceptible to habitat degradation of sea level rise. (SC)

Major BBS declines over the past 25 years; low abundance; depends on an uncommon habitat.(SC)

Seems this species can still be reliably found along the Delaware Bayshore and Atlantic Coast marshes, Hackensack Meadowlands, Great Swamp, Troy Meadows, and Wallkill NWR.(S/S)

Likely to become threatened if trends in NJ continue. (SC)

habitat is local and I agree it seems to be missing from some areas of appropriate habitat.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

A freshwater species that deserves elevated status, probably due to declines in freshwater/ mildly brackish wetland habitat.(SC)
population increasing in region but declining in NJ and breeding population has moderate threats (PIF 2016). We need to keep our eye on this species.(SC)

In many places a high salt marsh breeder and fairly local otherwise. But also utilizes phrags. BBS data show declines. (SC)

Breeding bird data show long-term serious decline, a trend also noted by birders. Not sure of cause, as they seem to be hard to find in places that have not undergone any noticeable change.(SC)

declining across the region due to habitat loss/degradation(SC)

BBS data show a decline and the habitat is very specialized and local.(SC)

Marsh Wren (*Cistothorus palustris*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable**

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	5.1			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

populations breeding outside of NJ show increases across range. Wintering birds do not seem to be limited by available habitat.(S/S)

Needs same habitat during migration as breeding.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Uses same habitats in migration as during breeding season (though occasionally found in fields during migration). Same habitat = same ranking, in my estimation.(SC)

Agree, this species is susceptible to habitat degradation of sea level rise. (SC)

Migrates through and winters in marshes, same as breeding season.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Migrates through habitat similar to breeding habitat. Fairly rare in winter now in NJ.(SC)

Habitat specialist.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Veery (*Catharus fuscescens*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	13	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.4				

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

SC status should be kept.(SC)

Fragmentation concerns, potential contraction of range regionally(SC)

Keep as SC.(SC)

limited habitat despite good initial population size. requires monitoring.(SC)

Seems to be holding steady in NY and PA based on a comparison of first and second atlas data. As a ground-nesting forest interior bird, it should continue to be monitored.(SC)

Declining slowly but steadily as a breeder and needs to be monitored.(SC)

BBS and Atlas data support the SC status.(SC)

Declining and breeds in big forests.(SC)

Currently listed as SC and population still declining(SC)

The maturing of forests should help this species recover.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Breeds in larger intact forests, worth monitoring due to habitat fragmentation. (SC)

Dependence on forests and forest structure warrants concern, especially where NE forests are undergoing vast changes due to deer pressure, invasive species, and fragmentation. (SC)

BBS trends and declining regional populations (PIF 2016) warrant SC status.(SC)

The declines indicated by the BBS data suggest that we should rank this as SC.(SC)

Local and declining enough to merit SC(SC)

Breeding bird data show a modest long-term decline, but sensitivity to habitat fragmentation suggests that species needs continued monitoring(SC)

Declining but still a modest population(SC)

Currently listed as SC and population still declining.(SC)

Based on the comments I think this species should continue to be monitored.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Forest interior species. Statewide distribution appears more or less unchanged since NJ BBA in the 1990s according to eBird data from last 10 Junes and Julys.(SC)

Slight decline indicated by BBS data.(SC)

Declining trend, but fairly common in appropriate habitat.(SC)

Population slowly declining in NJ but 40% of regional population has already been lost. Moderate threats breeding (PIF 2016)(SC)

BBS and Atlas data support keeping SC status. (SC)

Breeding bird data show a modest long-term decline, but sensitivity to habitat fragmentation suggests that species needs continued monitoring. (SC)

There is a slight decrease in the BBS data.(SC)

Veery (*Catharus fuscescens*) / Non-Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.5			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

40% of regional population has already been lost and breeding population has high threats (PIF 2016)(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Gray-cheeked Thrush (*Catharus minimus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Not Applicable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	0	1	1	10
Avg. CONF					1.0		7.8

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Does not breed anywhere close to NJ.(N/A)

Does not nest in NJ. (N/A)

Gray-cheeked Thrush does not nest near NJ.(N/A)

Does not breed in NJ.(N/A)

Gray-cheeked Thrush (*Catharus minimus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			7.0	4.9			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

The species is very regular migrant, spring and fall. People often don't enter their nocturnal call lists on eBird. Regional declines are quite serious enough for SC. (SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Declining regionally and regional status merit SC(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Uncommon migrant. PIF suggests a stable population.(S/S)

Fairly secretive forest species plagued by declines along the SE part of its range (almost extirpated as a breeder in Newfoundland, for example!), the populations that likely migrate through NJ.(SC)

The big drop in the Newfoundland population could be an issue if these birds are ever proven to use NJ in migration. (S/S)

Although Gray-cheeked Thrush is currently listed as a species of Special Concern, I don't see any justification for that classification.(S/S)

Not a very common bird on migration.(N/O)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Bicknell's Thrush (*Catharus bicknelli*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Not Applicable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	0	0	1	11
Avg. CONF							7.2

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Does not breed in NJ (closest is in NY).(N/A)

Doesn't nest in NJ. (N/A)

Bicknell's Thrush does not nest in NJ.(N/A)

Does not breed in NJ.(N/A)

Bicknell's Thrush (*Catharus bicknelli*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Not Reached

Summary of Round 4 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	4	1	9	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	7.0	5.0		

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

This species warrants status in NJ - despite a lack of data, it is very likely that a large proportion of the population passes through the state at least once a year.(SC)

NJ's role as a flyway for this species mean SC should be the minimum ranking here.(SC)

Insufficient data to make any accurate assessment.(U/U)

On PIF red watch list - a migrant was banded in NJ and recaptured during breeding season in Quebec(SC)

I think we should monitor this species but I don't think its status in NJ is clear enough.(U/U)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Small world population, threats to wintering grounds can warrant SC, but I'm not sure exactly what, if any, management could be done specifically for this species as a bird of passage whose actual numbers are very hard to quantify.(SC)

Small geographic breeding range and narrow migration pathways mean we should be concerned about this species when it passes through NJ. (SC)

On PIF red watch list - a migrant was banded in NJ and recaptured during breeding season in Quebec. (SC)

I don't think we understand its status in NJ. It seems to need monitoring, but I don't think we have enough baseline data to make a determination.(U/U)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Small world population, climate change threats on breeding grounds and deforestation on wintering grounds warrant special concern as ostensibly many individuals migrate through NJ.(SC)

This is a species of significant national importance due to its affinity for mountaintop breeding and the probability of losing this habitat to a warming climate. What we in NJ could do to benefit the species is still unknown.(U/U)

We are unlikely to get better data on the migrant status of this bird without more audio recording of singing birds in spring and banding records with in-hand measurements.(U/U)

Small population needs support as a regular migrant.(SC)

Complete lack of any useful data.(U/U)

This species has very low numbers as a whole. Offering preferred habitat can help them along their migration route through the state.(SC)

On breeding grounds to the north, numbers are small and declining due to habitat loss. Migrants in NJ should receive attention because of the implications for the species overall.(SC)

We need to monitor this species during migration.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Easily confused with Gray-cheeked Thrush. 2nd NY BBA indicates more blocks recorded this species than in the 1980s.(U/U)

Species is of particular interest as it is threatened by climate change in its mountaintop breeding habitat in New England and SE Canada AND by deforestation in critical wintering habitat, especially in Hispaniola. The bulk of the population likely passes over/ through New Jersey every single spring and fall migration, but we still know very little about the species. (S/S)

The number of migrants that come though in the fall should be carefully observed, the least we can do is try to understand the abundance of this migrant through flight call study, and likely habitat that thrushes in general like for safe harboring on their journey.(T)

Small population size with steep declines and very high threats to non-breeding population, and is on PIF's red watch list (PIF 2016). One Bicknell's thrush was confirmed during spring migration using bottomland forests in Cumberland County.(SC)

Small global population and known to migrate through NJ in spring and fall. (SC)

Probably of Special Concern because of small population and habitat limitations on wintering grounds, but I do not know of any supporting data.(U/U)

Bicknell's Thrush is so difficult to identify on migration (when it is not singing) coupled with the fact that it is a relatively recent split makes it very difficult to assess its status.(U/U)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Wood Thrush (*Hylocichla mustelina*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Not Reached

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	7	7	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			4.7	5.4			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Declines warrant SC status.(SC)

Many comments supporting S/S would seem to support SC, I'm not convinced of S/S.(SC)

Long-term declines due to habitat loss, especially understory destruction by deer, fragmentation.(SC)

Though this species is still widespread, overall declines and the comments of other panelists make me think it's worth listing as SC.(SC)

Currently listed as SC. It's on PIF yellow watch list and still declining, which does not warrant delisting. (SC)

Its still a common bird and doesn't require large forest tracks. I'm on the fence between SC and S and I know keeping it as SC is more conservative, but I think it is too widespread for that.(S/S)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

PIF Yellow Watch List Species (PIF 2016)(SC)

This is a bird that has declined considerably in abundance with the loss of forest understory due to deer brows and invasive species. While they do adapt to breeding in the high canopy, the abundances are greatly reduced. Should be on our radar!(SC)

Long-term declines due to reasons that are continuing.(SC)

Currently listed as SC. It's on PIF yellow watch list and still declining, which does not warrant delisting. (SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Declining BBS trend; declining regional trend, and PIF Yellow Watch List Species (PIF 2016)(SC)

BBS declines signal that we should rank as SC.(SC)

Needs to be watched but still numerous. (S/S)

Breeding bird data demonstrate a serious long-term decline. Habitat loss and fragmentation are probably key factors.(SC)

You can find them if you look for them, but declining in NJ over the past 40 years, with no signs of slowing.(SC)

Still a widespread species in NY and PA according to 2nd BBAs. Found in 83% and 93% of blocks, respectively. Declines noted in confirmed blocks since 1980's (-47% and -16%).(S/S)

Currently listed as SC and population still declining. 34% of global population breeds in Appalachian Mtns, 28% breeds in Mid-Atlantic. Still common in this area but as not common outside of the regions. (SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Found in the majority of blocks during the NJ BBA in the 1990s.(S/S)

Long term BBS declines.(SC)

Declining trend, but common in appropriate habitat.(SC)

Declining in NJ and very steep population declines through region with moderate threats to breeding population (PIF 2016). 60% of population already lost and half the current population is expected to be lost in 31 years if nothing changes (PIF 2016)(SC)

The BBS decline needs to be watched carefully, but still a fairly large and widespread population. (S/S)

Breeding bird data demonstrate a serious long-term decline. Habitat loss and fragmentation are probably key factors.(SC)

Reduced in numbers, but still a common bird in the right habitat. It can adapt to small woodlot fragments.(S/S)

Wood Thrush (*Hylocichla mustelina*) / Non-Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	2	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.5	5.2			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Ok to rank as SC because of habitat requirements being similar to breeding birds. Perhaps this should apply to all songbirds that we consider? (SC)

Threats to population include changing forest conditions, tropical deforestation, urbanization, energy/resource extraction, and invasive spp (PIF 2016). Most of these threats occur in NJ. (SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Declines seem to be rangewide; critical migrant habitat is similar to breeding habitat in NJ.(SC)

Very steep population declines in region and high threats to the non-breeding population(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Gray Catbird (*Dumetella carolinensis*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				6.9			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Gray Catbird (*Dumetella carolinensis*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	11	0	1	0
Avg. CONF				7.1			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Brown Thrasher (*Toxostoma rufum*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	1	12	1	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		5.0	5.6	5.0			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Keep as SC. Still relatively common in certain areas, but maturation of early successional woodlands could contribute to future decline.(SC)
 The species has always been common in NJ over the period of record, but loss of scrub/shrub successional vegetation to succession and landcover conversion has resulted in a decline in the recent past. The increase in CBC numbers likely due to a warming climate...an interesting bird to watch!(SC)
 Declining BBS trend. Declining regionally (PIF 2016)(SC)
 SC seems like the appropriate recognition, though T might not be far off.(SC)
 Keep SC status but it barely qualifies. (SC)
 Breeding bird data show serious long-term decline, a trend also noted by birders. Maturation of second-growth shrubby forests may be factor(SC)
 Needs to be watched closely as it's declining alarmingly fast. Still common in many areas though.(SC)
 Should attention should be considered for this species.(SC)
 Massive declines in NJ that correspond with loss of shrublands and changes in agricultural practices (fewer shrubby hedgerows now).
 Widespread regional declines over the past 30 years or so.(T)
 May become threatened soon. (SC)
 I think this species should be monitored until the downward trend stops. (SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Still widespread, but eBird data from the last 10 springs indicates a bit of a contraction from NJ BBA-mapped blocks in the 1990s.(SC)
 Still fairly common but has declined substantially, region-wide (compare the old and new New York Breeding Bird Atlas maps).(SC)
 Declining, becoming uncommon breeder(SC)
 Continued declines in NJ and steep declines in region with high threats to the breeding population (PIF 2016). 37% of population has already been lost in the region (PIF 2016). If this continues, wi(T)
 BBS declines support keeping SC status. (SC)
 Breeding bird data show serious long-term decline, a trend also noted by birders. Maturation of second-growth shrubby forests may be factor. (SC)
 BBS data indicate a sharp and continuing decline but Brown Thrashers are still fairly common in the right habitat.(SC)

Brown Thrasher (*Toxostoma rufum*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	5.2			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Uses same habitat in migration/winter as during breeding season.(SC)

Higher threats to breeding population than non-breeding population.(S/S)

Not very common and suffering a very long-term decline.(S/S)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

if habitat conversion is indeed at fault for widespread declines, the potential impact for overwintering birds may be real. Managing for them should be consistent with managing for scrub/shrub breeders.(SC)

Regionally declining(SC)

Short-distance migrant, with many wintering in S. NJ. Habitat requirements in winter fairly similar to breeding.(SC)

Similar concerns to breeding season but NJ isn't a critical wintering area.(S/S)

The same reasoning that applies to the breeding population seems to make sense here. it is still declining and, although it is fairly common in some areas, it is generally not very numerous. 2nd NY atlas showed a 30% decline.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Short-distance migrant, for the most part. Many winter in the southern part of the state.(SC)

Regional declines support a SC status. (SC)

There has been concern expressed about Brown Thrashers for many years and the decline seem to be continuing.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Purple Finch (*Haemorhous purpureus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	2	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			6.0	4.7			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Being driven out by two introduced species (House Finches and House Sparrows).(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Uncommon, limited range(SC)

Massive decline in second half of twentieth century, then House Finches moved in.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Breeds in NJ Highlands and portions of ridge & valley, often in or near Hemlock stands, which are being lost to the wooly adelgid.(SC)

Maybe rare enough to merit T or E, but more limited habitat so SC looks appropriate.(SC)

Makes sense that if other species with a narrow distribution limited to the Kittatinny and Highlands, such as Blue-headed Vireo and Winter Wren are special concern, this one should be too.(SC)

declining slightly in region but peripheral/intermittent breeder in NJ.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Largely a peripheral species that nests in small numbers in NJ. Local/ regional declines noted.(SC)

They may breed in Sussex County?(N/A)

BBS data show decline and isn't numerous, but mostly restricted to coniferous habitat. I support SC like in other songbird cases similarly involving conifer habitat. (SC)

Purple Finch (*Haemorhous purpureus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	11	0	1	0
Avg. CONF				5.0			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Worm-eating Warbler (*Helmitheros vermivorum*) / Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.5			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Slight increasing BBS trend in NJ, possibly warrants removal of SC status. (S/S)

Looks to be stable where habitat is.(S/S)

Population increasing in NJ and range-wide.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Appears to be solidly distributed in forested areas in northern NJ. eBird data from last 10 Junes suggests range is more or less the same as it was during the NJ BBA in the 1990s.(S/S)

Localized breeding range. (SC)

I probably need to consider a bit more. Has spread especially in the south and may be numerous and stable enough to remove SC status. (SC)

The map of NJ occurrences may be limited by surveys conducted in the 1990s and 2000s and repeated since.(S/S)

Worm-eating Warbler (*Helmitheros vermivorum*) / Non-Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.6			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Louisiana Waterthrush (*Parkesia motacilla*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	13	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			6.0	5.4			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Low-density breeder dependent on specific high-quality forest streams. (SC)

Stable as long as specialized habitat is. (S/S)

Mixed signals. PIF, PA BBS and 2nd PA BBA note an increasing trend. NY BBS and 2nd NY BBA show a decreasing trend. (S/S)

Population stable in NJ and increasing range-wide. (S/S)

LOWA is at risk because of its dependence on clean, wooded river habitats. However, it is still common in these habitats and current wetlands regulations would seem to afford these habitats adequate protection. (S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Forest interior species with scattered distribution. (SC)

I support affording SC because it is so local to specific healthy running waters with a low NJ population. (SC)

Louisiana Waterthrush (*Parkesia motacilla*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.5			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Regional declines support a SC status. (SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Golden-winged Warbler (*Vermivora chrysoptera*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Endangered

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	10	1	0	0	0	1	0
Avg. CONF	6.6	7.0					

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Well-documented declines. Some debate lately on whether GWWA is actually a species or not...should be monitored in terms of how it is treated here. (E)

Declining population, reduced appropriate habitat, hybridization with Blue-winged Warbler. 2nd NY and PA BBAs show the species occurs in less than half the number of blocks it did in the 1980s.(E)

This species is nearly extirpated from New Jersey, and it is in MAJOR trouble regionally due to hybridization/ introgression with Blue-winged Warbler and habitat transformation/ loss.(E)

GWWA is a very special bird among bird appreciators, one of the pinnacle species of warbler to see on a morning of study. That said, recent studies have found that GWWA and BWWA are 99.97% alike. There's a good summation of that study here along with informative and persuasive discussion afterwards: <https://www.allaboutbirds.org/mixed-wing-warblers-golden-wings-and-blue-wings-are-99-97-percent-alike-genetically/> Now I don't think we should consider this heavily in making a decision of conservation for this species. It does outline however the great challenges this species faces. I have heard of conservation efforts that the public in north jersey have not taken kindly to. (T)

Very localized, rare breeder. Steep declines in Golden-winged Warbler populations and young forest habitat. (E)

Very steep declines in NJ and in region, very small population size in state and region with limited distribution and high threats to the breeding population (PIF 2016). 61% of total population already lost and, if trends continue, half the current population will be lost in 34 years. On PIF's red watch list (PIF 2016). In NJ, if trends continue, population will be extirpated in less than 20 years.(E)

On the brink of vanishing from NJ. Keep as E. (E)

The decline of Golden-winged Warbler has been well-document and the species is appropriately considered endangered in NJ. Recovery program is underway. Species has largely disappeared from the northwestern part of the state where it was still common in the 1980's.(E) very low numbers, habitat specialist, threatened by hybridization with Blue-winged Warbler(E)

Continues to be displaced by (and hybridize with) Blue-winged Warbler . Habitat seems to be diminishing.(E)

GWWA is clearly endangered due to extremely low numbers, habitat limitations, and competition from BWWA; however, need info on whether this will remain its own species.(E)

Golden-winged Warbler (*Vermivora chrysoptera*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Endangered

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	12	0	1	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF	5.4		7.0				

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Should keep E status. If anything, things will get worse for GWWA(E)
State/regional/rangewide issues speak to need to protect this species throughout its travels(E)
PIF Red Watch List species (PIF 2016). Steep population declines and limited habitat(E)
Keep ranked as E during migratory periods as well.(E)
Eastern birds are in a bad way and there is no indication that those which move through NJ are anything but. (E)
Believe it should be considered endangered during non-breeding season.(E)
The species is in such decline it should be considered endangered wherever and whenever it occurs including in migration.(E)
Same reasons as for breeding. Population in steep decline.(E)
If we found a place where we knew they stopped over on migration in NJ, that place should be protected immediately.(E)
I'll vote with the majority and upgrade from T to E. (E)
This species (if it is actually different from BWWA) is clearly in danger of disappearing from the state or even altogether.(E)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Very scarce migrant.(E)
Regional declines are significant throughout the east. PIF lists this as one of the greatest species of continental importance.(E)
I'd keep this ranked as endangered year-round, I think. This bird is in a dire position, regionally.(E)
Should be T or SC, I voted SC because most of the core population doesn't seem to migrate through NJ.(SC)
Same reasons as for breeding. Very low population in steep decline.(E)
Scarce as a migrant and declining across it's entire range. (E)
Any and all conservation efforts should be taken. Providing preferred habitat could help this species.(E)
Uses fairly common habitats in NJ during migration (forest edge and tall second-growth).(SC)
Rarely reported in migration, but less specific habitat needs at this time.(S/S)
Threats include changing forest conditions, urbanization, and tropical deforestation. Migrants in NJ are likely breeders from NY and possibly Great Lakes region - new research will soon determine important stopover habitats, which are likely open forests with a diverse understory layer (also lacking in NJ)(T)
Not a lot of ebird sightings in the past 10 years.(E)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Scarce migrant.(SC)
This species is in major trouble, and has declined as a migrant in the state as well as a breeder (though it was never noted to be very common as a migrant).(E)
They will need equal protection along their migration route to help further their declining population(T)
Steep declines in Golden-winged Warbler populations and young forest habitat. (SC)
Very steep declines in region, small population size, and high threats to non-breeding population. 61% of total population already lost and, if trends continue, half the current population will be lost in 34 years. On PIF's red watch list (PIF 2016)(T)
Regional declines support a SC status. (SC)
Golden-winged Warbler is now a relatively uncommon migrant in NJ as populations to the north and east of us have declined. The species is retreating to the northwest as Blue-winged Warbler advances.(SC)
very low population in steep decline across range(E)
Same reasons as for breeding. the problem is regional - not just in NJ. The 2nd New York State breeding bird atlas showed a decline of 53% in this species.(E)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Blue-winged Warbler (*Vermivora cyanoptera*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Not Reached

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	6	8	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	5.0			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Declines suggest SC status.(SC)

Round 3 S/S comment that it should be monitored, meaning SC? BBS data compel SC.(SC)

Declines throughout NJ and NE, especially in coastal plains, with threats to breeding population.(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Reconsidering as SC due to decrease in shrubland habitat, decline noted in NJ BBS.(SC)

Definitely not secure/stable, based on BBS data and habitat preference.(SC)

Declines throughout NJ and NE, especially in coastal plains, with threats to breeding population. (SC)

Although it is still common in many places, I believe the population should be monitored.(S/S)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Declining BBS trend for NJ; declining regionally (PIF 2016).(SC)

BBS declines support ranking as SC.(SC)

Declining almost state-wide for decades (BBS Trend Map, 1966 - 2013).(SC)

NY BBS and PA BBS trends are leveling off or slightly declining. 2nd NY and PA BBAs show a northward expansion compared to 1st atlas efforts. Recent utility ROW maintenance policy may be detrimental to this and other scrub-shrub species.(S/S)

I can't ignore the declines in NJ and the region. This species is dependent upon old fields and forest disturbance. It is a ground-nester tolerant of agricultural and urban areas, which may also be a reason for it's decline in NJ. (SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Substantial declines noted in BBS data.(SC)

Steep population declines, small population size and moderate threats breeding (PIF 2016). 22% of total population has already been lost. If trends continue, will likely be threatened. (SC)

Needs to be monitored along with GWWA. BBS declines and habitat is transitional. What management would support them along with GWWA?(SC)

Breeding bird data show a long-term steady decline. Habitat succession probably plays an important role in this. The breeding range of this species is expanding north and seems to be contracting at the southern end. In Belleplain State Forest has become scarce where it was once common despite plenty of suitable habitat.(SC)

Still easily found in the right habitat.(S/S)

Blue-winged Warbler (*Vermivora cyanoptera*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.3			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Declines are regional as well and likely extend to threats posted on migration stopover and on the wintering grounds.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Black-and-white Warbler (*Mniotilta varia*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	11	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			4.0	5.3			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

steep regional population declines with moderate threats breeding, and 27% of total population already lost (PIF 2016). NJ declines are slight. (S/S)

Probably well on the border to SC but still widespread and relatively numerous. (S/S)

Black-and-white Warbler (*Mniotilta varia*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	11	0	0	1
Avg. CONF				5.7			5.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Prothonotary Warbler (*Protonotaria citrea*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	2	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	5.1			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Due to declines throughout range and listing as species of concern through PIF. Managing wet woods for the species could be very beneficial in NJ.(SC)

PIF Yellow Watch List species.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

NJ approaches north end of range. Appears secure where it occurs.(S/S)

Peripheral species here.(S/S)

small and increasing population in NJ but steep declines in region with moderate threats to breeding population (PIF 2016). On PIF yellow watch list and 38% of total population has already been lost (PIF 2016)(SC)

Local and low in number and density, but perhaps stable. (SC)

Prothonotary Warbler (*Protonotaria citrea*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	13	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.5			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Range-wide declines due in part to loss of habitat are alarming. Providing breeding habitat will also enhance stopover habitat in NJ.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Peripheral species here.(S/S)

Steep declines in region with moderate high threats to non-breeding population (PIF 2016). On PIF yellow watch list and 38% of total population has already been lost (PIF 2016)(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Swainson's Warbler (*Limnothlypis swainsonii*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Not Applicable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	1	0	2	9
Avg. CONF				5.0			7.1

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Rare vagrant in NJ; not a regular part of the avifauna.(N/A)

Not or not yet a regular summer visitor or known breeder in NJ. (N/A)

Swainson's Warbler has never been confirmed nesting in NJ, although there is suitable habitat and singing males have been recorded on multiple occasions.(N/A)

Does not breed in NJ.(N/A)

Swainson's Warbler (*Limnothlypis swainsonii*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Not Applicable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	1	0	0	13
Avg. CONF				7.0			5.9

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Rare overshoot migrant.(N/A)

S/S is the same as N/A in this case.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Rare migrant overshoot. Not reported every year.(U/U)

Rare vagrant in NJ; not a regular part of our avifauna.(N/A)

At best, they would occur only as a rare overshoot migrant in NJ(N/A)

Swainson's Warbler is a very rare vagrant to NJ from the south, usually only one every few years, although there have been a couple of years with multiple sightings.(N/A)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Nashville Warbler (*Oreothlypis ruficapilla*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Not Reached

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	5	8	1	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.7	4.3	4.0		

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Breeding range is largely peripheral to NJ.(S/S)

Convinced by SC comments over three rounds.(SC)

As I commented earlier, Nashville Warbler formerly nested along the dry tops of the Kittatinny Ridge and in bogs at Wawayanda St. Pk., but there seem to be no recent records. Still found in Pennsylvania, not too far from NJ, so could return(SC)

leave as SC(SC)

Not at all sure about this, but keeping it as C might be best.(S/S)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Current breeding status unknown. Maintain current status.(SC)

Leave as SC.(SC)

Peripheral breeder. 2nd NY BBA indicates a northward trend as southern forests mature (less warblers) and northern forests are opened for logging and increasing beaver population creates new wetland edges (more warblers).(U/U)

Currently SC and not enough data to warrant delisting.(SC)

There seems to be conflicting opinions about this one, but the overall low population and disappearance from some areas seems to warrant SC.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Leave as SC, but I wonder if they still breed in the state. There are only 3 June/July records in eBird (two of which are probably misidentifications). NJ is at the edge of the species range; still quite common in upstate NY.(SC)

Not confident in this vote, but this is a peripheral species as a NJ breeder.(S/S)

Numbers low enough for E or T, but limited habitat so SC.(SC)

Nashville Warbler formerly nested along the dry tops of the Kittatinny Ridge and in bogs at Wawayanda St. Pk., but there seem to be no recent records. Still found in Pennsylvania, not too far from NJ, so could return(SC)

Southeastern edge of range extends into NJ. If it is considered a species that "should" be in NJ, then it should be SC or T. Widespread eastern population declines according to BBS Trend Map, 1966 - 2013 (<http://www.mbr-pwrc.usgs.gov/bbs/tr2013/tr06450.htm>). (SC)

Population increasing in East. Rare breeder in northern NJ due to being at the edge of range. Lack of suitable breeding habitat may be a secondary factor limiting the breeding population in NJ. (S/S)

Round 1 comment about the Kittatinny Ridge area has persuaded me to change from S to SC.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Peripheral species.(S/S)

They have bred in the northern part of the state, but I would caution the population as a whole is for the most part stable in other parts of the country. I can easily be persuaded from this.(N/A)

Breeding status largely unknown. (SC)

Maintain SC status for very low numbers and locality. (SC)

Nashville Warbler formerly nested along the dry tops of the Kittatinny Ridge and in bogs at Wawayanda St. Pk., but there seem to be no recent records. Still found in Pennsylvania, not too far from NJ, so could return.(SC)

Nashville Warbler (*Oreothlypis ruficapilla*) / Non-Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	11	0	0	1
Avg. CONF				5.0			5.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Kentucky Warbler (*Geothlypis formosa*) / Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Threatened**

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	12	2	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		5.1	5.0				

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Has disappeared from many former nesting sites in and north jersey. Also faces threats from forest fragmentation and overabundant deer herbivory.(T)

Local (BBA/BBS) and regional (PIF) declines are significant. A warming climate would seem to increase the species yet we're not seeing that. Habitat factors may be at play and worth investigating.(T)

BBA and BBS data seem to indicate declines on a regional level. Obviously vanishing from many places in southern NJ. (T)

Declining BBS trend in NJ, regionally declining, and PIF Yellow Watch List species (PIF 2016).(T)

This species is largely gone from former haunts in Southern NJ. Habitat transformation could be one factor, but there could be other things at play here too. A nearly peripheral species now. Declines noted in BBAs in adjacent states (NJ/ PA).(T)

An already SC or T-worthy population that is declining so T. (T)

Breeding bird data show small decline in recent decades, but the species can be difficult to monitor. Formerly regular in north-central NJ (Morris County), but seems to have largely disappeared. Still widely distributed, but uncommon in southern counties. Forest fragmentation probably significant factor.(SC)

New Jersey is a small part of this species range and it's stable in most areas. I'd keep it as SC since it seems to be decreasing in the state, but I wouldn't call it Threatened.(SC)

There's no doubt that KEWA is in trouble in the state, determining conservation efforts would be hard to narrow down.(T)

Seems to need large patches of forest; almost undetected in BBS. (T)

Threats to the population include changing forest conditions, urbanization, and tropical deforestation (PIF 2016). The stronghold for the breeding population is the Central Hardwoods followed by Appalachian Mtns. Lack of forest structure likely a major component in the loss of breeding individuals in NJ. (T)

Based on the Round 1 comments and the scarcity of June-July records on e-bird, I am tentatively voting for "threatened".(T)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Need more concrete data, but has disappeared from many, many former strongholds in southern NJ in recent years. (SC)

eBird suggests breeding range has contracted since NJ BBA in the 1990s. 2nd NY and PA BBAs indicate significant declines since 1980s.(SC)

This species is largely gone from former haunts in Southern NJ. Habitat transformation could be one factor, but there could be other things at play here too. A nearly peripheral species now.(T)

KEWA numbers have dwindled in my personal observations in the state, they are a very hard bird to locate in the past few years.(T)

declining in NJ and steep declines in region with small populations in state and region. On PIF yellow watch list, moderate threats to breeding population and 29% of total population already lost (PIF 2016).(T)

Shrinking range and declining numbers are happening even more and support the change from SC to T. I could estimate the NJ population at 100-300 pairs. (T)

Breeding bird data show small decline in recent decades, but the species can be difficult to monitor. Formerly regular in north-central NJ (Morris County), but seems to have largely disappeared. Still widely distributed, but uncommon in southern counties. Forest fragmentation probably significant factor.(SC)

Kentucky Warbler (*Geothlypis formosa*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Special Concern**

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	13	0	1	0	0
Avg. CONF			4.8		4.0		

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Low density migrant; difficult to detect.(SC)

Bird is declining across range (PIF). (SC)

PIF Watch list species(SC)

VERY little data on migrants, especially fall migrants.(SC)

Regional declines(SC)

Central NJ is basically the northern limit of the species breeding range, so few migrants are detected. Same conservation factors apply for non-breeding season, but most depart by mid-September.(SC)

Keep it SC as we're the basically the Northern limit of the breeding range, so not many migrants..(SC)

Even as a migrant attention should be afforded to this species.(SC)

None coming through NJ from the north, but when breeders turn to migrants in the state, they should receive attention.(SC)

Currently listed as SC for non-breeding. It should not be delisted. (SC)

There are more ebird sighting during migration than during the breeding season.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Scarce migrant.(SC)

Migrant data is quite scarce on this species (rarely detected in NJ on migration).(T)

Steep declines in region, on PIF yellow watch list, high threats to non-breeding population and 29% of total population already lost (PIF 2016). (SC)

Regional declines support keeping the SC status. (SC)

Central NJ is basically the northern limit of the species breeding range, so few migrants are detected. Same conservation factors apply for non-breeding season, but most depart by mid-September.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Hooded Warbler (*Setophaga citrina*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.4			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Not enough evidence to down-list from current status.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Seems stable in some areas such as Delaware Water Gap NRA, but has disappeared from sites in central and northern jersey. Support leaving as SC.(SC)

Intact habitats are still losing numbers, maybe due to low of nesting micro-habitat due to invasive plants. Sensitive and not numerous so SC. (SC)

Fairly common in appropriate habitat in the northern pine barrens. BBS data show them increasing in the northern part of the state.(S/S)

Population is increasing in NJ and throughout and has already doubled its population. Notable increases in HOWA have been observed the past few years throughout northern NJ. (S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

eBird suggests NJ range is more or less the same since BBA in 1990s. Meanwhile, 2nd NY and PA BBAs shows significantly more blocks reported this bird than in the 1980s.(SC)

Localized breeder.(SC)

Population still fairly large but nesting habitats still at risk. I support keeping at SC. (SC)

Despite overall slight increase on breeding bird survey, seems to have diminished significantly in a large part of range in Pine Barrens(SC)

Hooded Warbler (*Setophaga citrina*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	13	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			7.0	5.2			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Declining regionally enough to merit SC(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Regional declines should support a SC status where there was none previously. (SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Cerulean Warbler (*Setophaga cerulea*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	14	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.1				

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Reasonably common along the upper Delaware River, but has disappeared from other sites in north jersey where it once bred. Overall population declines warrants SC.(SC)

BBS confidence intervals much too wide to be useful. While they may be increasing locally, the general consensus is a bird in trouble range-wide. Efforts should be made to enhance habitat and increase capacity for NJ birds to expand.(SC)

Picky with habitat requirements, but seems to be on the rise in NJ? Regional concerns. We really need to do a 2nd atlas. (SC)

Stable, but still limited range species with specific habitat requirements. Regionally declining, and PIF watch list species. (SC)

Regional declines suggest ranking this as SC in NJ would be appropriate.(SC)

Low numbers and locality in the state continue to support the SC status.(SC)

Although the Cerulean Warbler seems to be doing well in NJ, its breeding range is limited to mature forests along the Delaware River and the Highlands. Has decline dramatically in the central part of its range and bears watching(SC)

Stable or increasing in Northern New Jersey where it breeds, but status globally warrants SC at the very least.(SC)

The central part of the state has seen significant declines. Although CERW seems to be doing okay in the northern part of the state, attention should be given to it to keep the population going. Perhaps efforts in the central part of the state could help reestablish a population there.(SC)

Seems to be doing OK in NJ but horribly throughout almost the entire rest of the species range.(SC)

81% of the global population breeds in the Appalachian Mountains. Threats to population include tropical deforestation, changing forest conditions, urbanization, and energy/resource extraction (PIF 2016)(SC)

On the fence between S and SC but the PIF regional data seems to support SC.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Forest interior bird with limited range, specific habitat requirements.(SC)

Localized breeding. PIF watch list species. (SC)

population increasing in NJ but in very steep declines throughout the region with a small population size and high threats to the breeding population. On PIF's yellow watch list, 72% of the total population has already been lost, and if trends continue half the current population will be lost in 26 years (PIF 2016).(SC)

Low numbers and locality in the state continue to support the SC status. (SC)

Although the Cerulean Warbler seems to be doing well in NJ, its breeding range is limited to mature forests along the Delaware River and the Highlands. Has decline dramatically in the central part of its range and bears watching.(SC)

Cerulean Warbler (*Setophaga cerulea*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	11	2	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.3	5.0			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

SC status should be kept(SC)
Regional concerns justify SC(SC)
PIF Yellow Watch List species(SC)
Very rare migrant(SC)
Rare migrant and also PIF watch list species with dramatic declines to our north and west.(SC)
Should keep at SC due to scarcity even during non-breeding season.(S/S)
Scarce migrant, but regional declines support SC status.(SC)
Should be watched during migration through NJ.(SC)
I'm on the fence between SC and S but regional decline may warrant monitoring.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Very rare migrant in NJ away from breeding grounds.(SC)
For the same reasons as above.(SC)
PIF watch list species(SC)
Rare to detect this bird as a migrant in NJ.(SC)
Regional declines support a SC status.(SC)
PIF shows steep decline.(SC)
Currently listed as SC and current regional declines do not warrant delisting. (SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Scarce migrant.(SC)
PIF watch list species. (SC)
in very steep declines throughout the region with a small population size and high threats to the non-breeding population. On PIF's yellow watch list, 72% of the total population has already been lost, and if trends continue half the current population will be lost in 26 years (PIF 2016).(SC)
Regional declines support a SC status. (SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Northern Parula (*Setophaga americana*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	2	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.5	5.2			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Local and needs support(SC)

Increasing in NJ and throughout region with low threats to breeding population (PIF 2016). A notable increase in breeding population has been observed in northern NJ. (S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Forest interior species with specific habitat requirements.(SC)

In NJ their older-growth trees with moss micro-habitat is local and sparse enough to merit continuing the SC status. A quirky bird for nesting in NJ nowadays or maybe always. (SC)

Northern Parula essentially disappeared as a breeding bird in NJ by the mid-1970's but has come back strongly. It can now be found nesting in many parts of the state from Sussex to Cape May counties, especially common along Delaware River. Because population crashed in the mid-19th century, should still be closely monitored.(SC)

BBS shows an increasing trend.(S/S)

Northern Parula (*Setophaga americana*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	10	0	0	1
Avg. CONF				5.9			5.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Many Northern Parula nest north of New Jersey and it is an abundant migrant through the state.(S/S)

Seen at places like the Great Swamp on migration.(S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Bay-breasted Warbler (*Setophaga castanea*) / Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Not Applicable**

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Avg. CONF							7.1

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Doesn't breed closer than the Adirondack High Peaks.(N/A)

Does not breed in NJ so it should have a N/A breeding status.(N/A)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

To the extent that it's an extremely sparing and/or occasional breeder in NJ, I would support a SC status. (SC)

Bay-breasted Warbler does not nest near New Jersey.(N/A)

Does not breed in NJ.(N/A)

Bay-breasted Warbler (*Setophaga castanea*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable**

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	9	0	1	1
Avg. CONF				5.2			5.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Population rise and fall with spruce budworm infestations.(S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Blackburnian Warbler (*Setophaga fusca*) / Breeding Status

☒ Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	11	2	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.1	5.0			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Keep SC status.(SC)

Local/low-density, some issues e.g. woolly adelgid(SC)

Uncommon breeder in NW corner of the state, threats from climate change, woolly adelgid, etc.(SC)

Could go either way on this one but sided with sticking to current status due to points raised by other reviewers, especially limited and threatened preferred habitat.(SC)

2nd NY and PA BBAs indicate species is stable or increasing compared to first atlas efforts. A peripheral species in NJ, but seems solidly represented in Kittatinny and northern Highlands. Restricted range warrants SC.(SC)

Small NJ pop that should persist if forest habitat sticks around, but should get some continued attention in NJ, even if it is doing fine regionally. (SC)

Currently listed as SC and data/comments do not fully support delisting. (SC)

ebird sightings in the past 10 years show a very limited breeding range.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Restricted to NW corner of the state, often uses Hemlock groves that are under threat from the woolly adelgid. Keep as SC. (SC)

Possibly stable, but local with specific habitat requirements. (SC)

I'm happy to rank as SC given the scarcity of breeders in NJ. Trends look better for this than several other species ranked as SC.(SC)

Blackburnian Warbler is at best a marginal breeding species in NJ, confined primarily to the Highlands of northeastern Sussex County and adjacent Passaic County. Preservation of the limited habitat in this area is critical to its continued success as a local breeder.(SC)

Dependent on conifer forests in the northern part of the state. If deforestation continues, one can assume that BLBW will follow.(SC)

Population stable in NJ and slightly increasing eastern US. Regularly occurs in coniferous forests in northern NJ. (S/S)

Breeding range in the state is too small for anything higher than a classification of SC.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Local breeder. (SC)

Possibly increasing but still largely tied to coniferous patches in mature forest. Keep SC status. (SC)

Blackburnian Warbler is at best a marginal breeding species in NJ, confined primarily to the Highlands of northeastern Sussex County and adjacent Passaic County. Preservation of the limited habitat in this area is critical to its continued success as a local breeder.(SC)

Limited range in the state.(SC)

Blackburnian Warbler (*Setophaga fusca*) / Non-Breeding Status

☒ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	10	0	0	1
Avg. CONF				5.3			5.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Black-throated Blue Warbler (*Setophaga caerulescens*) / Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Special Concern**

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	13	1	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			4.9	4.0			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

OK with maintaining SC status.(SC)
 Large majority in SC is telling of habitat issues here(SC)
 Limited specialty habitat and small population in the state.(SC)
 Small breeding population that needs its habitat protected.(SC)
 Breeds in small numbers and local in specific habitat type. Needs monitoring(SC)
 Peripheral breeder, but protection of this species worthwhile.(SC)
 Few breeders in the state but tied to high-quality habitat(SC)
 Needs large forests so it will need continued management.(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Preservation of uncut northern woodlands will help this species persist in the state.(SC)
 Local/low-density but in high-quality habitat(SC)
 Limited number of breeders in a small portion of the state; keep as SC.(SC)
 Only a small number of breeders in the state. (SC)
 SC for similar reasons for Blackburnian Warbler.(SC)
 Breeds in small numbers and local in specific habitat type. Needs monitoring.(SC)
 NJ population deserves some attention due to small size and habitat needs.(SC)
 NJ is on periphery of breeding range and population trends support delisting. (S/S)
 limited breeding range justifies rank of SC. It requires very large tracts of forest for breeding.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Peripheral breeding species in NJ; leave as SC.(SC)
 Quite local/ limited range, but trends look OK relative to other similarly-ranked species.(SC)
 Smaller numbers and locality in NJ support the present SC status.(SC)
 Black-throated Blue Warbler is at best a marginal breeder in NJ, confined to the extensive woodlands of the Highlands and the upper Delaware Valley. Protection of this habitat is essential to its continued presence as a nesting species in the state.(SC)
 Small numbers and similar threats face BTBW compared to other warbler species in the state.(SC)
 Overall population has more than doubled and still increasing. (S/S)
 Like Blackburnian Warbler, this species has such a restricted breeding range in the state that SC is appropriate.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Forest interior bird with specific habitat requirements.(SC)
 Very local breeder.(SC)
 Smaller numbers and locality in NJ support the present SC status. (SC)
 Black-throated Blue Warbler is at best a marginal breeder i NJ, confined to the extensive woodlands of the Highlands and the upper Delaware Valley. Protection of this habitat is essential to its continued presence as a nesting species in the state.(SC)
 Limited range in NJ.(SC)

Black-throated Blue Warbler (*Setophaga caerulescens*) / Non-Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	10	0	0	1
Avg. CONF				5.4			5.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Prairie Warbler (*Setophaga discolor*) / Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	14	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			4.8				

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Declines suggest SC status.(SC)

Habitat management concerns(SC)

Populations fast declining in the state, but still common in proper habitats where they still occur.(SC)

A Round 3 comment was "Rapid declines as a breeder in NJ, but good numbers still breed in state. I support SC for now.(S/S)". So we're at 11-1 SC-SS.(SC)

Much less common as a breeding bird than 30-40 years ago. Habitat loss through succession and development probable causes.(SC)

Specific habitat requirements including fire management, species of regional responsibility.(SC)

Forest succession, lack of disturbance, and urbanization listed as causes for decline. (SC)

Although it is still somewhat common in places, its habitat requirements are somewhat specific and it is declining.(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Specific habitat requirements including fire management, species of regional responsibility.(SC)

PIF watch list and good chance habitat will decline with conversion to either more mature forest or development (SC)

This and other species of successional habitats are in decline.(SC)

Rapid declines as a breeder in NJ, but good numbers still breed in state. I support SC for now.(S/S)

Steep population decline in recent decades. As noted previously, probably combination of development and forest succession.(SC)

Habitat requirements on breeding grounds in NJ mean that we should give some attention to this species. It probably was never in huge numbers before logging, but some attention is merited.(SC)

Population in state and region in danger of becoming threatened. (SC)

Based on several Round 1 and Round 2 comments I am switching from S to SC. It is still common in the right habitat, though.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Needs specific habitat requirements that are ephemeral and is a species of regional responsibility. (SC)

PIF watch list. Species requires a mosaic of habitat succession to thrive, whether it's coastal disturbance or managed forests and fields.(SC)

PIF watch list species. Declining BBS trend.(SC)

BBS declines support SC ranking. Succession of nesting habitat is probably a big factor.(SC)

NJ and regional declines but habitat succession will continue to be an issue.(SC)

BBS data for NJ are alarming, despite being able to find them in good numbers in central NJ.(SC)

In addition to succession, current management policies along utility ROWs may be detrimental to this and other species that use scrub-shrub habitat.(SC)

45% of the global population breed along the Atlantic Coast (already declined by 41%); 15% breed in Appalachian Mtns (already declined by 78%). Threats include tropical deforestation, changing forest conditions, and urbanization (PIF 2016).(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Common breeder in parts of the state, but has experienced steep declines. PIF watch list species. (SC)
declines in NJ and very steep declines throughout region. On PIF yellow watch list with moderate threats to breeding population. 53% of total population has already been lost (PIF 2016)(SC)
BBS declines and somewhat ephemeral nature of nesting habitat support a SC status. (SC)
The Breeding bird data show a steep decline in the nesting population of Prairie Warbler in NJ. This is probably due to a combination of development and succession of the second-growth habitat that the species favors.(SC)

Prairie Warbler (*Setophaga discolor*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable**

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	2	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			7.0	4.9			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Regional declines support SC status.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

very steep declines throughout region. On PIF yellow watch list with moderate threats to non-breeding population. 53% of total population has already been lost (PIF 2016)(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Black-throated Green Warbler (*Setophaga virens*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	12	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.5				

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Local/low-density, some habitat issues(SC)
 Ties to threatened Hemlock forests; forest interior species that needs larger tracts of woodlands.(SC)
 Limited breeding range and possibly multiple subspecies occupying NJ. (SC)
 Should remain SC based on limited state range and habitat.(SC)
 Maintain as SC as it's vulnerable to decline and a local breeder in the state.(SC)
 Close ties to the threatened Hemlocks warrants special concern.(SC)
 Small range, small population, forest interior-dependent.(SC)
 Currently listed as SC. Data/comments do not support delisting. (SC)
 Despite increasing numbers I believe this forest-interior species needs monitoring.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

SC due to the species ties to Hemlock forests for breeding and degradation of said habitat from adelgid.(SC)
 limited breeding range in NJ and disjunct populations which may represent subspecific variants. Maintain SC status.(SC)
 Limited as a breeder in NJ. One note - the coastal plains birds in NJ have not been formally ascribed to waynei (known from SC to VA), nor is waynei thought widely to be a distinctive taxon.(SC)
 Locally sensitive species.(SC)
 Black-throated Green Warbler is primarily confined to the Delaware Valley and the northern part of the Highlands, with a small, scattered population in the Pine Barrens. As a forest interior species, they require protection of the relatively large intact woodlands that those areas provide(SC)
 Limited population in state.(SC)
 We should keep it's current status.(SC)
 BBS maps show stable/increasing in eastern region and in NJ.(S/S)
 Population increasing region-wide and notable increase in breeding observations in northern NJ. (S/S)
 Requires large forest patches and has a very restricted NJ breeding range.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Forest interior bird with specific habitat requirements.(SC)
 Currently special concern. Limited knowledge of breeding population status(SC)
 Smaller numbers and locality support the SC status. Birds occasionally found nesting in the Pinelands may represent a remnant of the Coastal Plains subspecies (waynei) which seems greatly reduced in its range now. (SC)
 Black-throated Green Warbler is primarily confined to the Delaware Valley and the northern part of the Highlands, with a small, scattered population in the Pine Barrens. As a forest interior species, they require protection of the relatively large intact woodlands that those areas provide.(SC)
 Limited breeding range in NJ.(SC)

Black-throated Green Warbler (*Setophaga virens*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.4			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Canada Warbler (*Cardellina canadensis*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	8	1	0	2	0
Avg. CONF			5.3	5.0			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Habitat specialist, only found in the northernmost stretches of the state as a breeding bird. Some decline seems apparent. (SC)

Forest interior bird with specific habitat requirements. Limited range.(SC)

Declining trend in East. Local breeder. (SC)

population declining in NJ and in steep declines throughout region with moderate threats to the breeding population. On PIF's yellow watch list and 62% of the population has already been lost. (SC)

Smaller numbers and locality support keeping SC status. (SC)

Canada Warbler has declined as a breeding bird and retreated northward during recent decades. Now confined to the northern Highlands and the Delaware Valley area. Was common breeder at Black River WMA in the early 1980's, disappeared completely by 2000.(SC)

small breeding population in state. very specific habitat requirements(SC)

Limited breeding range in NJ.(SC)

Canada Warbler (*Cardellina canadensis*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Not Reached

Summary of Round 4 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	5	9	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	4.6			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

The estimate that 1/3 to 1/2 of the global population stops in NJ during migration strikes me as suspicious. (S/S)

NJ's role in migration merits SC.(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

I wasn't aware of the estimate about what proportion of the global population stops over in NJ, but given that estimate, this is an obvious SC. (SC)

We need to keep an eye on this species during migration.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Regional declines support a SC status.(SC)

Massively-declining breeding populations to the north likely come through NJ, meriting attention.(SC)

Threats include changing forest conditions and tropical deforestation with higher threats to the non-breeding population. 19% of global population breed in Southern Shield and Maritime Region (already 80% decline) and 38% breed in Eastern Boreal Region (already 39% decline). It's possible that 1/3 to 1/2 the global population stopover in NJ. (SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

population in steep declines throughout region with high threats to the non-breeding population. On PIF's yellow watch list and 62% of the population has already been lost. (SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Yellow-breasted Chat (*Icteria virens*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	13	1	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.3	5.0			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

This is a localized breeder across the state that prefers second-growth habitat; worth monitoring.(SC)

Another shrub/forest interface species dependent on managed lands and/or natural disturbance. (SC)

BBS declines regionally, almost surely tied to early successional habitat.(SC)

Decline and sensitive habitat(SC)

Breeding bird data show steady decline in NJ nesting population. This is likely due to development and to maturation of the early successional habitat they require. Where habitat is managed in a way to provide this, as at Higbee Beach WMA, chats do very well(SC)

Still a common breeder in the South part of the state, but seems to be declining even in appropriate habitats.(SC)

Easy conservation efforts can be taken to provide preferred breeding habitat.(SC)

Declining, needs an uncommon habitat type, and NJ trend is part of broad eastern decline.(SC)

Currently listed as SC. Continued declining trend does not warrant delisting. (SC)

Not a very common bird in the state, especially in the north.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Reduced population, less suitable habitat.(SC)

Very uncommon in northern NJ. I'm less familiar with south Jersey, but this species is more common in the south. (SC)

moderate declines in region with moderate threats to the breeding population. 11% of population has already been lost (PIF 2016)(SC)

Some decline in BBS data but still looks somewhat stable in NJ. Keep SC status and monitor the fairly-ephemeral edge habitats it needs like Prairie Warbler. (Indigo Bunting and Blue Grosbeak, at least, appear to be far less local. (SC)

Breeding bird data show steady decline in NJ nesting population. This is likely due to development and to maturation of the early successional habitat they require. Where habitat is managed in a way to provide this, as at Higbee Beach WMA, chats do very well.(SC)

Seems to be hit or miss in the right habitat.(SC)

Yellow-breasted Chat (*Icteria virens*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	13	1	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.2	5.0		

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Reduced suitable habitat.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Eastern Towhee (*Pipilo erythrophthalmus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	11	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	5.0			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

This species should be watched, but still common enough to be S/S.(S/S)
 Close to SC but not quite yet; there are big pockets in the pines.(S/S)
 The population needs to be monitored due to declines and habitat needs. (SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

This is a species of regional responsibility. Still common at coastal locations such as Sandy Hook & Island Beach, but threatened by overabundant deer herbivory and loss of second-growth habitat.(SC)
 still common, but also requires similar habitat to Brown Thrasher and other mid-successional habitat species that ARE showing declines. Something to keep an eye on...(S/S)
 Steep declines, despite being common in many areas(SC)
 This bird has been on a fairly steep decline for a while now and deserves recognition/ ranking as SC.(SC)
 Large numbers in some parts of the pine barrens despite big statewide declines due to maturing forests.(S/S)
 NY BBS and PA BBS also show declines. 2nd NY and PA BBAs show species is still widespread with changes in overall blocks of -12% and +5%, respectively, since 1980's.(S/S)
 Still an abundant species, but 43% of global population has already been lost. It is a ground-nester that is tolerant of development and agriculture which may make it more susceptible to declines in NJ. We need to monitor this species. (SC)
 I am switching to S because it is still widespread and common but it should be monitored for future continuing declines.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Steep declines in NJ and in region with moderate threats to breeding population (PIF 2016)(SC)
 Could be close to Brown Thrasher as a SC, but numbers and localities in Atlas considerably higher. Species should be watched closely, as it seems to be an excellent indicator for shrubby habitats of many kinds. (S/S)
 Breeding bird data for New Jersey and for the northeast show sharp decline in this species over multiple decades. Destruction of ground cover and shrub habitat by deer may be important factor.(SC)
 Still quite common in many areas although it has been declining for a number of years.(SC)

Eastern Towhee (*Pipilo erythrophthalmus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	10	0	0	1
Avg. CONF				5.6			5.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

CBC numbers have remained steady or slightly increased in recent decades.(S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Field Sparrow (*Spizella pusilla*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	13	1	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			4.8	4.0			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Agree with other comments supporting SC.(SC)

Habitat management concerns(SC)

special concern due to loss of appropriate habitat and population in decline.(SC)

I know where to find one or two, but only one or two.(SC)

Loss of habitat to development and succession have significantly reduced breeding population.(SC)

Seems like appropriate habitat management could benefit this species, which may be one of "regional responsibility." (SC)

As previously mentioned, the loss of this successional preferred habitat warrants management and a careful eye.(SC)

PIF common bird in steep decline and depends on ephemeral habitat(SC)

Another still common species that is declining.(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Requires "young forest" aka early second-growth woodlands/old fields. (SC)

PIF common bird in steep decline and depends on ephemeral habitat.(SC)

Still quite widespread here and elsewhere. It was recorded in far more atlas blocks than not in NJ, NY, and PA.(S/S)

seems to be declining across it's range and needs monitoring(SC)

Loss of breeding habitat to development and forest succession shows need for habitat management.(SC)

You can find one or two in the right habitat, but that habitat is uncommon, and they're in steep decline overall.(SC)

Steep declines.(SC)

The habitat for this species is in jeopardy so continued declines can be expected.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Still common in places I regularly visit, but ostensibly threatened by loss of suitable second-growth/early successional habitat. A species to watch.(SC)

As with EATO and BRTH, inhabits the interface between woodlands and shrub/grasslands. Requires habitat management and/or periodic disturbance. (SC)

PIF common bird in steep decline. Declining BBS trend(SC)

BBS data show decline; close to Brown Thrasher and Eastern Towhee in habitat requirements.(SC)

NJ sensitivity and regional declines(SC)

Breeding bird data show sharp decline of this species in NJ. This is probably due to development and to successional growth of the ephemeral habitat they require for nesting. Active management of habitat may be needed to sustain this species(SC)

Steady declines in NJ and across the east for decades. Could soon need management intervention.(SC)

13% of global population breeds in Appalachian Mtns (74% lost since 1970); 14% breeds along Atlantic Coast (68% lost since 1970). It is a low shrub/ground-nester that is tolerant of development and agriculture which may make it more susceptible to declines in NJ. We need to monitor this species. (SC)

on the fence between S and SC.(SC)

[Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments](#)

PIF Common bird in steep decline.(SC)

declining in NJ and steep declines in the region with moderate threats to the breeding population, on PIF brown watch list for common birds in steep decline. 62% of the total population has already been lost and if trends continue, will lose half the current population in 36 years (PIF 2016)(SC)

Similar to Eastern Towhee but less widespread. Could be very close to SC. (S/S)

Breeding bird data show sharp decline of this species in NJ. This is probably due to development and to successional growth of the ephemeral habitat they require for nesting. Active management of habitat may be needed to sustain this species.(SC)

steeply declining as a breeder in the state(SC)

Although it is declining it is still a common bird in the right habitat.(S/S)

Field Sparrow (*Spizella pusilla*) / Non-Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	10	0	1	0
Avg. CONF				5.2			

[Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments](#)

No comments received.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Vesper Sparrow (*Pooecetes gramineus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Endangered

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	13	1	0	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF	5.8	4.0					

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

At best, this has become an erratic and occasional breeder in NJ, used to occur at various locations in north & central jersey. (E)

Very low-density breeder.(E)

Very rare breeding bird, and seems to continue to decline. Still think we need more data. (E)

Tough to figure how to rank species that formerly (pre-colonial) didn't have much of a history in New Jersey due to the forest cover of the state pre-agricultural and clearing, but this one is almost gone as a breeder in the state and deserves ranking.(E)

Likely to stay about as rare as it is now(E)

With the grassland species, do they all rank T due to habitat scarcity? Or do some, like VESP, qualify for E status? Leaning toward T unless there's evidence for E. (T)

Vesper Sparrow has essentially disappeared as a breeding bird in NJ due to development of farmland and reversion of abandoned farms to woodlands. Active management of grasslands and fallow fields will be necessary if this species is to maintain any presence as a nesting bird in the state.(E)

Another rare grassland species in danger of local extirpation.(E)

Efforts should be taken to determine appropriate habitat and expand it.(E)

The only reason the BBS numbers aren't still declining is that there are hardly any left.(E)

Currently listed as endangered and has continued declines.(E)

Extremely rare(E)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Does it still breed in the state? Restricted to Sussex County in recent years; needs more data. (E)

Rare grassland bird with specific habitat requirements.(E)

VESP has been on a steady decline the last two decades- I would be hard pressed to find one on territory in historical locations.(T)

Very rare breeder and becoming increasingly rare. (E)

population in decline and in very small numbers in NJ. Steep declines in region with moderate threats to breeding population. 30% of total population already lost (PIF 2016)(E)

Population data supports E status, however this is on certain grassland habitats that are changing/ have changed. I think T is a better fit because habitat will continue to be limited.(T)

Vesper Sparrow has essentially disappeared as a breeding bird in NJ due to development of farmland and reversion of abandoned farms to woodlands. Active management of grasslands and fallow fields will be necessary if this species is to maintain any presence as a nesting bird in the state.(E)

few nesting locations remain in the state due to widespread habitat loss. declining across the region(E)

Very uncommon and local.(E)

Vesper Sparrow (*Pooecetes gramineus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	1	11	1	0	1	0
Avg. CONF		7.0	5.6	5.0			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

This is a scarce migrant in NJ, worth protecting grassland habitat where it occurs.(T)

Scarce and declining migrant with regional declines.(SC)

Regional declines/ endangered breeding status in the state.(SC)

Regional decline(SC)

in steep decline across the entire Eastern US(SC)

Always special to see a VESP on migration. Providing habitat will help.(SC)

NJ likely used as a migratory path along the east coast.(SC)

currently listed as SC with continued declines in region. (SC)

Significant regional decline making it less numerous during the non-breeding season.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Scarce migrant.(SC)

Declining regional trend(SC)

Steep declines in region with moderate threats to non-breeding population. 30% of total population already lost (PIF 2016)(SC)

I support SC status because of regional declines. (SC)

in steep decline across the entire Eastern US(E)

According to the NY state breeding bird atlas, it is declining there as well. This is probably contributing to its decline as a non-breeding bird in NJ.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Savannah Sparrow (*Passerculus sandwichensis*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Threatened

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	14	0	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		5.8					

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Another grassland breeder in significant decline, worth protecting any habitat during summer where this species and other obligate breeders like Bobolink remain.(T)

Land use landcover change has led to a decline in available suitable habitat for this species. (T)

Obvious declines, and obvious issues with maintaining quality breeding habitat. (T)

Declining populations, loss of grassland habitat. (T)

It IS threatened in NJ due to a lack of appropriate grassland, but despite this is still a common bird over a broad swath of North America including gaps across the boreal forest - I consider it largely peripheral in NJ.(T)

numbers and limited and/or managed habitat(T)

Breeding bird data show a drastic decline in the population of Savannah Sparrow over multiple decades. Like other grassland species, this is due to development, successional issues, and agricultural practices. Will require active management of habitat to maintain suitable sites for the sparrow.((T)

Another grassland species threatened.(T)

Most of grassland species are in decline.(T)

Major declines for decades due to habitat loss.(T)

Currently listed as threatened with continued declines. (T)

Will be difficult to establish and maintain sufficient suitable habitat.(T)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

eBird suggests a range contraction since the NJ BBA in the 1990s. Less suitable habitat.(T)

Uncommon breeder, loss of grassland habitat.(T)

continued decline in NJ and steep declines in region. 40% of total population already lost (PIF 2016). Will be endangered in NJ if trends continue. (T)

I support a T status like for most grassland species in NJ. Current grassland management measure seem to enhance mor for Grasshopper Sparrow and less for Savannah. (T)

Breeding bird data show a drastic decline in the population of Savannah Sparrow over multiple decades. Like other grassland species, this is due to development, successional issues, and agricultural practices. Will require active management of habitat to maintain suitable sites for the sparrow.(T)

declining numbers and habitat loss(T)

Habitat is ephemeral and hard to preserve.(T)

Savannah Sparrow (*Passerculus sandwichensis*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	2	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	5.1			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Most of grassland species are in decline.(SC)

Needs coastal habitats during stopovers.(SC)

Still a widespread migrant.(S/S)

Declining in region but CBC count increasing. (S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Regional declines support a SC status. (SC)

Declining in the entire region.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Grasshopper Sparrow (*Ammodramus savannarum*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Threatened

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	9	1	0	0	1	0
Avg. CONF		4.8	6.0				

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Numbers seem to be on slow decline; threatened by mowing. More data needed.(T)

eBird suggests a range contraction since the NJ BBA in the 1990s. Less suitable habitat. Habitat succession. 2nd NY BBA shows a significant reduction of blocks reporting this species compared to 1980s. 2nd PA BBA shows slight increase.(T)

GRSP is a very sensitive grassland species that should be paid attention to. Ensuring it's success will allow NJ to sustain a healthy population perhaps preventing this species from slipping further away.(SC)

Uncommon breeder. Loss of grassland habitat. (T)

continued declines in NJ and very steep declines in the region with high threats to breeding population, and 68% of total population already lost (PIF 2016). (T)

Grassland management measures seem to stabilizing population but still very local and probably always will be. (T)

Like other grassland species, threatened by development, succession and agricultural practices. Does well in areas managed for appropriate habitat, such as Negri-Nepote, Duke Farms, etc.(T)

habitat loss and mowing operations threaten already low numbers (T)

Habitat is declining. (T)

Grasshopper Sparrow (*Ammodramus savannarum*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	11	1	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.3	4.0			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

SC based on habitat needs(SC)

Worth protecting sites where this and other grassland species use during migration.(SC)

requires attention throughout eastern range due to lack of grassland, suppression of disturbance processes that maintain grasslands, and very low population size. (SC)

Rarely detected migrant.(S/S)

hard to detect, but probably warrants SC.(SC)

Same concerns as for breeding season.(SC)

Probably not huge numbers coming through NJ.(SC)

Currently listed as SC. Data/comments do not support delisting(SC)

Agree that habitat is the issue here.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Any areas/habitat where Grasshopper Sparrow is found during migration is worth protecting.(SC)

Regional declines.(SC)

Habitat quality/availability issues seem to at least point toward an SC here.(SC)

Uses habitat similar to breeding habitat during migration, though habitat choice can be a bit broader in migration.(SC)

regional declines(SC)

Same as breeding season reasons(SC)

Hard to detect as a migrant and extremely rare in winter. regional declines support SC status at least.(S/S)

Uses same habitat during migration as breeding. Breeding populations to the north likely stopover in NJ.(SC)

currently listed as SC with continued declines in region. (SC)

Significant decline in numbers and in habitat.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Less suitable habitat.(SC)

PIF common bird in steep decline (Atlantic Coast Joint Venture region)(SC)

very steep declines in the region with moderate threats to non-breeding population, and 68% of total population already lost (PIF 2016). (SC)

Regional declines support a SC status. (SC)

Same as breeding season reasons.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Henslow's Sparrow (*Ammodramus henslowii*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Endangered

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF	6.3						

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Possibly breeds at one location. (E)

rare breeder in very limited geographic range. Grassland obligate with little nearby source population.(E)

Species of both state and regional interest. Pretty habitat-specific and management-heavy. (E)

Rare and sporadic breeder, very low numbers. PIF yellow watch list species (PIF 2016)(E)

Should be ranked as "Endangered" due to extremely limited nature of nesting behavior, though almost lost. There's basically no population connectivity here, as the species doesn't breed regularly in NE PA or SE NY anymore.(E)

very low numbers and likely to remain that way(E)

Once a common summer resident of upland marshes along the Delaware Bayshore and shrubby grasslands as far north as Morris County, Henslow's Sparrow essentially disappeared as a breeding bird by 1970. Since then a pair nested at Lakehurst in the early 1990's and one or two have attempted to nest at Duke Farms in a few recent years (2008, 2014, 2015). Recovery will require management of large fields with suitable habitat - overgrown shrubby grasslands(E)

Very rare breeder in state.(E)

Need to encourage the very small number of breeders that still exists.(E)

Habitat specialist with almost no breeding population in NJ.(E)

High threats from conversion of agriculture and urbanization. (E)

Critically endangered.(E)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

To my knowledge, only breeds at 1 site in the state. Endangered by default.(E)

Very few recent nesting records.(E)

Some of the last remaining birds in Somerset are carefully watched and monitored. This species will soon be extirpated as a breeder from the state and will need a larger discussion in asserting it's status in NJ(E)

Rare and sporadic breeder(E)

very low numbers in NJ with continued population declines in region and high threats to breeding population. 10% of an already low total population has been lost, and is on PIF's yellow watch list (PIF 2016)(E)

Numbers reflect a E status, but very local to limited grassland habitat. Ephemeral habitat as well. (T)

Once a common summer resident of upland marshes along the Delaware Bayshore and shrubby grasslands as far north as Morris County, Henslow's Sparrow essentially disappeared as a breeding bird by 1970. Since then a pair nested at Lakehurst in the early 1990's and one or two have attempted to nest at Duke Farms in a few recent years (2008, 2014, 2015). Recovery will require management of large fields with suitable habitat - overgrown shrubby grasslands.(E)

Almost gone from the state as a breeding bird.(E)

Henslow's Sparrow (*Ammodramus henslowii*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Endangered

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	11	0	1	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF	5.1		7.0				

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Possibility that some breeding birds could remain all year. Habitat needs likely suggest E(E)
 Worth protecting habitats where this and other grassland species use during migration and/or winter.(E)
 Typical plight of grassland birds. Regional declines also support listing.(E)
 Rarely detected migrant.(E)
 Very rare at any season in the state.(E)
 Now very rare migrant, population declines in the region. Habitat protection might help, but prefers different types than other "grassland" species.(E)
 Numbers merit protection during migration, and if found to winter in NJ.(E)
 Currently listed as endangered with continued declines in region.(E)
 In trouble throughout the region.(E)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Any habitat that this species finds suitable during migration is probably worthy of protection and benefits other grassland species.(E)
 Rarity as a migrant and regional declines.(E)
 I suppose this should have an E ranking year-round, as it could even winter in the state on occasion (recent wintering record in PA and extremely skulky behavior suggest this possibility).(E)
 regional declines(SC)
 Formerly an uncommon spring and fall migrant, now a very rare fall migrant, with only four records in the past ten years(E)
 Should require similarly rare habitats during molt and migration as it does during breeding.(E)
 Currently listed as endangered with continued declines in region. (E)
 Very few sighting on ebird in the past 10 years.(E)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Infrequently recorded as migrant.(E)
 Very rare on migration.(E)
 continued population declines in region and high threats to non-breeding population. 10% of an already low total population has been lost, and is on PIF's yellow watch list (PIF 2016)(SC)
 Regional declines support a SC status. (SC)
 Formerly an uncommon spring and fall migrant, now a very rare fall migrant, with only four records in the past ten years.(E)
 Nearly as rare as a non-breeder.(E)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Nelson's Sparrow (*Ammodramus nelsoni*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Not Applicable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	0	0	2	9
Avg. CONF							7.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Doesn't nest in NJ. (N/A)

Nelson's Sparrow does not nest near New Jersey.(N/A)

Does not breed in NJ.(N/A)

Nelson's Sparrow (*Ammodramus nelsoni*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 4 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	13	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	4.6			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Seems to be a fairly common migrant in coastal marshes, mostly during fall when birders seek them. Sea level rise could be a concern.(S/S)

PIF yellow watch list species(SC)

Saltmarsh habitat widely used in migration and winter is under threat from sea level rise.(SC)

regional decline and habitat in danger(SC)

Small and declining breeding populations to the north use NJ coasts during spring and fall migration.(SC)

The entire population winters along the Atlantic Coast and Gulf Coast, which includes NJ. Threats include climate change, changed agricultural practices, and urbanization. We need to watch this species. (SC)

Several very recent sightings on ebird.(S/S)

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Again, salt marsh habitat is threatened by SLR and marsh subsidence, suggesting that it still needs to be monitored and preferably managed for.(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Habitat used in migration is threatened.(SC)

We need to watch this species(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Underreported migrant due to habitat it frequents.(S/S)

moderate population declines in region and high threats to non-breeding population. Also on PIF's yellow watch list (PIF 2016)(SC)

Regional declines and vanishing habitat support a SC status. (SC)

Fairly common migrant and uncommon wintering species, primarily in the coastal and bayshore marshes, but shy and hard to obtain accurate population data.(S/S)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Saltmarsh Sparrow (*Ammodramus caudacutus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Threatened

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	12	0	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		5.3					

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

T at minimum, E status likely to come soon. Lots of problems here, discussed by the panel and lots of agreement on issues. (T)
 Regional population declines, threats from sea-level rise and marsh degradation. (T)
 SLC and marsh subsidence conspire against this species.(T)
 Will change to T based on numerous comments regarding decline, habitat loss; importance of BCR 30.(T)
 Still relatively common in appropriate habitat but declining. Loss of it's specialized habitat is alarming due to ditching of saltmarsh.(T)
 As one panelist pointed out, recent work predicts a collapse of the global population of Saltmarsh Sparrow (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/cobi.12797/full>)(T)
 Habitat threats are only going to get worse.(T)
 I will vote with the majority. (T)
 Comments from Round 1 and 2 convince me that this bird is in more trouble than I realized.(T)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

A species that will be affected by sea level rise; still present in many salt marshes in Atlantic County, but doesn't seem to be as numerous as it once was in Ocean/Monmouth/Middlesex county saltmarshes.(T)
 Recent work predicts a collapse of the global population of Saltmarsh Sparrow (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/cobi.12797/full>) (T)
 Major concerns from sea level rise. (T)
 PIF Red Watch List Species; steep declines, small populations; habitat threatened by climate change. (T)
 Numbers appear to be way down in southernmost coastal marshes where formerly bred. Some strongholds remain in Atlantic and especially Ocean County marshes. Needs continued monitoring on a population-wide scale; a species in big trouble from future sea level rise.(T)
 Requires T status as numbers and habitat quickly vanish(T)
 This available from SHARP surveys: <http://www.tidalmarshbirds.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2016/02/New-Jersey-SHARP-summary.pdf>.
 "Saltmarsh Sparrow: highest abundance in northeast region; 33% of northeast regional population." NJ's high regional responsibility and current/imminent SLR threat suggest T status. (T)
 Not sure if there is any data on Saltmarsh Sparrow abundance as a breeding bird, but its habitat is vulnerable to development, ditching and rising sea levels.(SC)
 Consistently declining as a breeder in the state and already breeds in very low numbers. Mosquito ditching caused it to disappear from many of it's breeding spots in the southern part of the state.(T)
 I'll support SC, it should be watched closely.(SC)
 Small populations living in habitat that is disappearing.(T)
 Currently listed as SC but new data warrant E. SHARP data show "9% annual decline in the global breeding population for saltmarsh sparrows and an overall 2.3% decline in the specialist bird community. Simple extrapolations of these numbers estimate the saltmarsh sparrow population will likely be reduced to fewer than 500 individuals in 50 years, indicating a very high risk of extinction for this species within our lifetimes". 94% of population already lost. BCR 30 (which includes NJ) has been identified as an area of highest importance for the breeding population. Threats include climate change and urbanization, specifically the presence of tidal restrictions (road crossings) downriver of marshes. (E)
 ebird does have several June/July sightings in the past few years. However, Round 1 comments seem to justify some kind of monitoring.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Numbers appear to be way down in southernmost coastal marshes where formerly bred. Some strongholds remain in Atlantic and especially Ocean County marshes. Needs continued monitoring on a population-wide scale; a species in big trouble from sea level rise. (T)
Partners in Flight indicate species is rapidly decreasing. 2nd NY BBA reported species in 15% fewer blocks than in 1980s.(SC)
SALS population is on the decline and can be directly related to rising water levels. For now, I think this species is okay, but it's environment will detrimentally affect it's population in the future. We will have to closely watch what happens, events set in motion will be hard to turn around for this species.(S/S)
Habitat loss (high marsh), and threatened by rising sea level. PIF Watch list species. (T)
On PIF's red watch list with very steep declines, small population numbers, very limited breeding distribution, and very high threats to the breeding population (PIF 2016).(T)
I would request some report from SHARP data to better assess. Habitat is endangered, and I think declining numbers support a T status. I could broadly estimate NJ population at 300-1000 pairs. (T)
Not sure if there is any data on Saltmarsh Sparrow abundance as a breeding bird, but its habitat is vulnerable to development, ditching and rising sea levels.(SC)
small population, specialized habitat, and difficult detectability(SC)

Saltmarsh Sparrow (*Ammodramus caudacutus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Not Reached**

Summary of Round 4 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	2	11	1	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		4.5	5.1	5.0			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Agree with SC comments.(SC)
obvious habitat concerns(SC)
Could soon be T(SC)
data lacking, but surely declining along with appropriate habitat.(SC)
From the BNA account: "without management intervention, extinction by mid-century is likely." Seems like SC during the non-breeding season is warranted here.(T)
Steep population declines and threat to habitat from rising sea levels merit special concern.(SC)
Same as for Nelson's during migration, the habitat they depend on is under serious threat due to SLR and marsh subsidence. Additionally this bird is on the PIF red watch list.(SC)
Probably should be T or E based on high risk of extinction(T)
With the regional threats that it faces, I think it should be closely monitored.(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

SC for awareness if nothing else (SC)
Regional declines, threats from sea level rise.(SC)
Same as above. (SC)
declines across it's range justify SC(SC)
Many of them leave the state in winter, but the same concerns apply as to breeding status.(SC)
Winter habitat similarly threatened.(T)
Regional population is likely endangered. I will settle for T for non-breeding as well. (T)
Facing similar threats during the non-breeding season.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Regional declines, sea level rise warrant SC status.(SC)

Recent work predicts a collapse of the global population of Saltmarsh Sparrow (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/cobi.12797/full>) (T)

Threats from storm/flood events, sea level rise. Habitat the same. (SC)

PIF red watch list species(SC)

Same rationale as breeding. These specialists migrate through and winter in the same coastal saltmarsh habitats in NJ that are used for breeding.(T)

I voted SC but could soon be T because of species-wide decline(SC)

On PIF's red watch list with very steep declines, small population numbers, limited non-breeding distribution, and high threats to the non-breeding population(SC)

limited information as a migrant and wintering bird, but clearly regional declines would warrant SC. (SC)

I'll support SC, it should be watched closely.(SC)

Similar habitat limitations as breeding season.(SC)

BCR 30 (which includes NJ) has been identified as an area of highest importance for the non-breeding population. Based on SHARP data, "the saltmarsh sparrow population will likely be reduced to fewer than 500 individuals in 50 years, indicating a very high risk of extinction for this species within our lifetimes". 94% of population already lost. Threats include climate change and urbanization, specifically the presence of tidal restrictions (road crossings) downriver of marshes. (E)

Round 1 comments seem to justify some kind of monitoring.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

As with breeding status, needs more monitoring. Sea level rise and more frequent flooding events are likely compromising traditional wintering and stopover areas. (T)

Breeding and migration habitat are basically the same.(SC)

PIF Watch list species. (SC)

On PIF's red watch list with very steep declines, small population numbers, limited non-breeding distribution, and high threats to the non-breeding population (PIF 2016).(T)

Regional declines and habitat reductions support a SC status, at least. (SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Seaside Sparrow (*Ammodramus maritimus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	2	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			6.0	5.0			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Seems more resilient than Saltmarsh Sparrow & other saltwater species. Still numerous in marshes along the northern half of the NJ coast, where habitat remains.(S/S)

PIF yellow watch list species(SC)

BCR 30, which includes NJ, listed as highest importance for breeding population. Threats include climate change and urbanization. We need to monitor this species. (SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Partners in Flight shows no loss in population in last 44 years. However, 2nd NY BBA reported species in 25% fewer blocks than in 1980s. (U/U)

PIF Watch list species.(SC)

population is still common and stable/increasing in region, but breeding population faces high threats and it's on PIF's yellow watch list (PIF 2016). (SC)

Their habitat is not decreasing and are still numerous in many places. It is local so always watching for potential SC status. (S/S)

Seaside Sparrow (*Ammodramus maritimus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	8	0	2	0
Avg. CONF				5.1			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

PIF Watch list species.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

White-throated Sparrow (*Zonotrichia albicollis*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Not Applicable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	1	1	0	12
Avg. CONF				4.0	4.0		5.7

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Peripheral species(N/A)

Not regularly known as a breeder in the state at the moment.(N/A)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Northwest NJ approaches south edge of breeding range. There are very few breeding records according to NJ BBA. 2nd NY and PA BBAs report declines.(U/U)

An occasional and/or extremely limited breeder in NJ. I support a SC status. (SC)

White-throated Sparrow is at best a marginal breeding bird in NJ, probably not nesting every year. In thirty years of birding the Highlands and Kittatinny ridges, I found one nesting pair.(N/A)

NJ is on the periphery of its breeding range.(N/A)

White-throated Sparrow (*Zonotrichia albicollis*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	11	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				6.3			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Summer Tanager (*Piranga rubra*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	9	0	2	0
Avg. CONF				5.0			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Population is on the rise in NJ and is expanding northward through the state.(S/S)

Could be on the edge for SC status but numbers are fairly stable in NJ. (S/S)

Summer Tanager (*Piranga rubra*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	8	0	2	1
Avg. CONF				5.0			5.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Scarlet Tanager (*Piranga olivacea*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	10	0	1	0
Avg. CONF				5.6			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

population increasing in NJ but moderately declining in region with moderate threats to breeding population. 7% of total population already lost (PIF 2016)(S/S)

Stable or slightly increasing in state. Keep watching for SC status. (S/S)

Scarlet Tanager (*Piranga olivacea*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.8			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Rose-breasted Grosbeak (*Pheucticus ludovicianus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Not Reached

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	3	11	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			4.7	4.8			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

We've seen enough of this species declining without raising concern, now's the time.(SC)

This charismatic species has been experiencing regional declines and needs to be monitored.(SC)
population declining - we at least need to monitor more closely(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Declining up and down the east coast, including in northern NJ.(SC)
population declining - we at least need to monitor more closely(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Regional declines warrant SC. An occasional breeder at southern limit of range in central NJ.(SC)
declining enough to be supported now(SC)
Declining for decades as forests mature in the state.(SC)
We need to monitor the decline of this species(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

population continuing to decline in NJ and steep declines in region, with 30% of total population already lost (PIF 2016)(SC)
BBS data show lower numbers and steady decline in NJ. Just enough to warrant SC status I think at this time. (SC)
Although breeding bird data show significant decline over several decades, this is probably due to loss of habitat as the species remains common in undeveloped areas.(S/S)

Rose-breasted Grosbeak (*Pheucticus ludovicianus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	9	0	1	1
Avg. CONF				5.3			5.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Dickcissel (*Spiza americana*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Not Applicable

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	0	0	0	13
Avg. CONF			5.0				5.1

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Not an annual breeder at any point in history. (N/A)

Although at the edge of this species' range, it's worth protection as an emblematic grassland bird whose breeding habitat requirements also benefit many other T&E grassland species.(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Protecting habitat for Dickcissel would also benefit other grassland species. At periphery of this species' breeding range. (SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

NJ isn't in this species' "true" range, it's worth protecting it when nesting in NJ. Habitat used by Dickcissel is generally good habitat for associated species like Grasshopper & Savannah Sparrow, and Bobolink.(T)

A grassland specialist and one known to range far due to fluctuations in core-breeding area weather (dry/wet flux). Managing for grassland species would provide refuge for this species when irruptions occur, which are predicted to increase in a changing climate.(SC)

Limited grassland habitat. Although NJ is at the periphery of its range, perhaps there are enough breeding records to warrant SC status(SC)

This seems to be a peripheral grassland species that doesn't have regular breeding strongholds in the state.(N/A)

This epitomizes the difficulty with grassland species. It's not so much what to think about the birds but about the habitat. This species doesn't regularly breed..... possibly yet, but a SC status is the highest I can go when it comes to a yes, native, but largely non-native to NJ habitat to begin with.(SC)

NJ is at the periphery of its range(N/A)

Grassland species should be all of concern at minimum.(SC)

While individuals are observed in NJ during the breeding season, this species is known to be a vagrant well outside its breeding range of the midwest. Overall population is stable.(N/A)

Not a regular breeder in NJ. If it qualifies, it would probably merit an SC status.(N/A)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

NJ not a key part of this bird's range.(U/U)

Another grassland species that has increased in the past decade from personal observation. I would consider having a DICK breeding on a local grassland to be pretty special in NJ, certainly something that doesn't happen a lot. Having quality grasslands will help produce and secure populations of grassland species.(SC)

Probably doesn't breed every year in NJ, but perhaps enough breeding to warrant SC status given more limited grassland habitat. (SC)

New Jersey lies outside the historic range of Dickcissel. Pairs have nested or attempted to nest at a variety of grassland sites around the state in past 20 years, perhaps taking advantage of drought or loss of habitat within their normal range. Dickcissel remains a peripheral breeding species in the state, although that could change as they take advantage of available habitat.(N/A)

very low numbers , specialized breeding habitat(T)

NJ is at the periphery of its range.(N/A)

Dickcissel (*Spiza americana*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.5			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Core range is currently secure, and species uses a variety of available habitats during migration(S/S)

NJ could be important for migrants, not clear.(U/U)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

NJ is at the periphery of its range.(N/A)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Bobolink (*Dolichonyx oryzivorus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Threatened

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	14	0	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		5.4					

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Grassland habitats are in short supply, this and other associated species warrant protection.(T)
 Another grassland specialist that benefits from proper management.(T)
 Mowing, habitat modification are issues. Keep T status. (T)
 Limited grassland habitat. Declining regional populations, and PIF yellow watch list species. (T)
 PIF watch list species - grassland/ appropriate agricultural habitat is the key here.(T)
 Low enough numbers and local to managed grasslands and some farm fields(T)
 Bobolink is dependent on the availability of hayfields, pastures and grasslands. Mowing of hayfields prior to fledging is a major problem.
 Maintenance of appropriate habitat will be crucial to Bobolink continuing as a nesting species in NJ(T)
 Seems very vulnerable to a multitude of threats in the state and elsewhere. Habitat decline is a big problem and populations have declines in the state.(T)
 Should keep it's current status.(T)
 Long-term downward trends in the state and widely east of the Mississippi River (though some growth in southern breeding populations).(T)
 Currently listed as T with continued declines. (T)
 Not sure that we really understand this bird's habitat requirements. I am switching from SC to T based on the Round 1 comments.(T)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Overall declines shown; main threats from development and mowing practices. Should remain at this status. (T)
 ENSP species occurrence data and eBird data from last ten Junes suggest range has not considerably changed or perhaps a slight contraction since NJ BBA in the 1990s.(T)
 Limited habitat and breeding populations. PIF watch list species. (T)
 continued declines in NJ and very steep declines in the region with moderate threats to breeding population. On PIF's yellow watch list, 60% of total population already lost and if trends continue, half the current population will be lost in 48 years (PIF 2016)(T)
 Keep T status because of declines and limited grassland habitat. (T)
 Bobolink is dependent on the availability of hayfields, pastures and grasslands. Mowing of hayfields prior to fledging is a major problem.
 Maintenance of appropriate habitat will be crucial to Bobolink continuing as a nesting species in NJ.(T)
 habitat loss(T)
 Habitat requirements seem to be unclear. It is present one year in a field and then gone for several year, only to return again. However, the numbers are down. (SC)

Bobolink (*Dolichonyx oryzivorus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 4 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	12	2	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.1	5.0			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Re-iterating earlier comments: This species concentrates into small areas with lots of food (like coastal Delaware Bayshore marshes) after breeding in order to undertake a complete molt before migrating. They are especially vulnerable at that time.(SC)

Habitat concerns; many migrate through Cape May(SC)

Things haven't gotten better for this species, keep SC.(SC)

Still an abundant migrant in many habitats(S/S)

Protecting habitats used by this species during migration is beneficial.(SC)

This species needs a refuge during migration due to widespread loss of grasslands regionally, and management of grasslands on breeding grounds to the north.(SC)

currently listed as SC and declines do not support delisting(SC)

The habitat is ephemeral and endangered and the numbers are down regionally.(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Habitat considerations and general decline suggest SC(SC)

Protecting habitats used by this species during migration is beneficial.(SC)

Major movements through NJ and tight habitat affinities support the status.(SC)

Abundant migrant(S/S)

Migrants need attention given the breeding-season declines.(SC)

currently listed as SC and declines do not support delisting. (SC)

Maintaining habitat in NJ will increase the Bobolink's survival during migration.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

NJ is part of this species migration route, and habitats Bobolinks use during spring/fall are worth protecting. (SC)

A PIF watch list and species of concern across the range.(SC)

PIF yellow watch list species(SC)

This species concentrates into small areas with lots of food (like coastal Delaware Bayshore marshes) after breeding in order to undertake a complete molt before migrating. They are especially vulnerable at that time.(SC)

regional concern and declines(T)

Abundant migrant(S/S)

Migration has good numbers although severely depressed historically.(SC)

Migrants from the north move through NJ looking for seeds to eat on the trip south. Widespread declines mean that attention should be paid to migrant Bobolinks in NJ.(SC)

Widespread migrant not bound to same breeding habitat requirements.(S/S)

Threats include changes in agriculture and urbanization. Population declines more severe in the East than Upper Midwest. Need to keep an eye on the non-breeding population as well. (SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

A long-distance migrant that has been shown to use NJ as a part of its migration route. 1000s migrate through Cape May peninsula July-October. Given regional declines, perhaps a species to consider as one to protect during migration. (SC)

PIF watch list species. (SC)

very steep declines in the region with high threats to non-breeding population. On PIF's yellow watch list, 60% of total population already lost and if trends continue, half the current population will be lost in 48 years (PIF 2016)(T)

Regional declines support a SC status. (SC)

Abundant migrant(S/S)

Similar to breeding status.(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Eastern Meadowlark (*Sturnella magna*) / Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Threatened

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	11	1	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		5.2	5.0				

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Obvious declines alongside other grassland guild members.(T)

Grassland species that has declined significantly as a breeder in NJ.(T)

Another grassland species requiring protection.(T)

Changing to T in acknowledgement of range contraction, continued declining numbers.(T)

Should be moved from SC to Threatened as declines continue at an alarming pace. Habitat faces many threats.(T)

Sharp decline and limited available habitat.(T)

Massive declines in NJ and almost range-wide, should be at least T.(T)

Currently listed as SC and declines are still drastic with a reduced population(T)

Ebird sightings in the past 10 years don't seem that much different from the distribution found during the NJ Breeding Bird Atlas project.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Another grassland species worth protecting to the fullest extent. Species is gone from many former areas.(E)

Regional declines and habitat affinities require active management to prevent the species from becoming endangered.(T)

Seems to be a bit data-deficient, but declines seem obvious. (SC)

BBS declines and limited habitat in NJ. Also declining regionally, and PIF common bird in steep decline (PIF 2016). (T)

Steep declines suggest a real problem here, regionally. I still don't think that NJ's conservation focus should be on grasslands, but this species has undergone big losses across much of its range.(T)

Sharp decline on limited habitat(T)

Breeding bird data show drastic decline in nesting population over past several decades. In 2016, virtually all reports of breeding birds were from protected grasslands, parks, and airports. Very few on farms or other areas(T)

Declining drastically and steadily in the state as a breeder. Very troubling trend for this species that was once very common.(T)

Another grassland species that should be watched.(SC)

Large sustained declines in NJ and throughout eastern N. America (<http://www.mbr-pwrc.usgs.gov/bbs/tr2013/tr05010.htm>). (T)

Currently listed as SC and declines are still drastic with a reduced population. (T)

Still viable populations in the right habitat.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

More data needed, but declines obvious in many areas.(SC)

The ENSP-supplied species occurrence map suggests meadowlark range has not changed considerably since NJ BBA in the 1990s. However, eBird data from the last ten Junes would indicate the range has contracted significantly, especially in Salem, Sussex, and Warren Counties.

2nd NY and PA BBAs show the number of confirmed blocks has declined 37 and 29%, respectively, since the 1980s.(SC)

Limited breeding population, limited grassland habitat. PIF common bird in steep decline. (SC)

Continued steep population declines in NJ and region with moderate threats to breeding population. On PIF's brown watch list for common birds in steep decline, 77% of total population already lost, and if trends continue, the current population will be cut in half in 23 years (PIF 2016)(T)

Change from SC to T status because of declines. It used to be more versatile than other grassland species but has recently declined further. (T)

Breeding bird data show drastic decline in nesting population over past several decades. In 2016, virtually all reports of breeding birds were from protected grasslands, parks, and airports. Very few on farms or other areas.(T)

declining and now absent from many areas where it formerly bred(T)

Habitat and numbers are both declining.(SC)

Eastern Meadowlark (*Sturnella magna*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Special Concern**

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	14	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.2				

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

In my experience, numbers of migrants at coastal sites has declined.(SC)

Steep declines noted in PIF 2016. Dependence on a declining habitat type(SC)

number of birds encountered on migration and during winter have decreased sharply in last 20 years.(SC)

Declining regionally, and PIF common bird in steep decline (PIF 2016). (SC)

Uses similar habitat in breeding and nonbreeding seasons.(SC)

regional declines(SC)

Now an uncommon migrant and scarce wintering bird(SC)

regional declines are significant.(SC)

Another grassland species that should be watched.(SC)

Big declines in winter numbers for the past few decades, to go along with breeding season declines.(SC)

Need to monitor this species(SC)

Not a common migrant.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

CBC and likely migrant numbers remain low.(SC)

Limited breeding population, limited grassland habitat. PIF common bird in steep decline. (SC)

Continued decline in CBC numbers in NJ and very steep declines region with moderate threats to non-breeding population. On PIF's brown watch list for common birds in steep decline, 77% of total population already lost, and if trends continue, the current population will be cut in half in 23 years (PIF 2016)(SC)

Regional declines support a SC status. (SC)

Now an uncommon migrant and scarce wintering bird.(SC)

I don't often encounter it outside the breeding season.(U/U)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Rusty Blackbird (*Euphagus carolinus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Not Applicable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	0	0	1	10
Avg. CONF							6.8

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Doesn't nest in NJ. (N/A)

Rusty Blackbird does not nest near NJ.(N/A)

Does not breed in NJ.(N/A)

Rusty Blackbird (*Euphagus carolinus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Special Concern

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	1	13	0	0	0	0
Avg. CONF		6.0	5.3				

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

This is a species in trouble, worth monitoring and protecting at sites where relatively large numbers still occur at inland wetland sites, mostly.(T)

Regional declines are significant. Wet woodlands in NJ can support migrants and wintering individuals. (SC)

Decline on regional level + importance of some sites and habitats in NJ for species.(SC)

PIF common bird in steep decline.(SC)

I think this should be at LEAST treated as SC. Declines are so substantial that it might be worth considering ranking this as threatened in NJ. (SC)

regional declines(SC)

Breeding population and, thus non-breeding population is much reduced(SC)

Regional declines support SC, but seems to have stabilized based on CBC data.(SC)

Species should be watched. Preferred wet woodland habitat could help this species here.(SC)

Needs wet woods free from other blackbirds during the winter.(SC)

We need to monitor this species(SC)

Round 1 comments indicate sever regional decline.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

Big declines obvious on regional level. Some sites in NJ that host numbers of wintering and migrant RUBL. (SC)

Breeding population and, thus non-breeding population is much reduced.(SC)

Severe population declines of RUBL have seemingly stabilized slightly for the time being. Acknowledging that what remains is only a very small percentage of what we used to have, encouraging appropriate habitats on it's winter grounds in NJ will continue to serve the species well.(SC)

PIF common bird in steep decline (Atlantic coast joint venture region)(SC)

Declining and erratic in NJ, very steep declines in region with moderate threats to non-breeding population. On PIF's brown list for common birds in steep decline, 89% of total population already lost, and if trends continue half the current population will be lost in 19 years (PIF 2016).

Known to winter in NJ as weather conditions allow. (SC)

Regional declines support a SC status. (SC)

Although this species has declined dramatically as a breeding bird, there is no clear trend shown by CBC data.(S/S)

declining across its range(SC)

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Baltimore Oriole (*Icterus galbula*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	9	0	1	0
Avg. CONF			3.0	5.4			

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

declining in nj and in region, but still abundant. 42% of total population already lost (PIF 2016). (S/S)

Numbers still OK and widespread in NJ. (S/S)

Breeding bird data indicate significant long-term decline, but not sure how reliable this is. Species should be monitored as could be of special concern if downward trend continues.(S/S)

Baltimore Oriole (*Icterus galbula*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 1 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	9	0	1	1
Avg. CONF				5.5			5.0

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Golden Eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*) / Non-Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 4 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	13	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			5.0	4.9			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Increasing as a migrant in the east.(S/S)

The Eastern Golden Eagle population is still very small relative to the western ssp. and land-use/land-cover changes as well as wind farm development may threaten it.(SC)(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

The Eastern Golden Eagle population is still very small relative to the western ssp. and land-use/land-cover changes as well as wind farm development may threaten it.(SC)

If anything, seems to be increasing.(S/S)

Based on Katzner, et. al., NJ is not an integral part of this species regular migration route or wintering area.(S/S)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Uncommon migrant along the Kittatinny Ridge, and winter resident in south jersey marshes, mostly Atlantic/Cumberland Counties. (U/U)

Eastern Golden Eagles may eventually warrant species designation. They migrate through NJ in low densities and some winter in the state.(T)

Apparently a low-density wintering bird on large salt marshes, particularly the Tuckahoe/Egg Harbor, Mullica, and Maurice River marshes.

Detected annually in fall migration. Not sure we have enough data to make any real decisions here. (U/U)

Small numbers winter in the state. The small eastern population of Golden Eagle has increased since the 1970s - see Katzner et al.'s paper - STATUS, BIOLOGY, AND CONSERVATION PRIORITIES FOR NORTH AMERICA'S EASTERN GOLDEN EAGLE (AQUILA CHRYSAETOS) POPULATION).(SC)

Small, declining population, although NJ isn't a major migration or winter location for this eastern population(SC)

Occurs regularly in low numbers but NJ may see the results of slow increase in the eastern states in general. (S/S)

Recent hawkwatch totals have increased, though it's should be watched carefully as a top predator.(S/S)

Scarce migrant and diffuse winter resident. Most of the eastern Canadian birds pass by to the west, where numbers are increasing at hawk watches such as at Waggoner's Gap, PA..(S/S)

Overall population is stable/slightly increasing. (S/S)

I'm not too familiar with this species, but the hawk watch numbers appear to be fairly steady (but low). It is a peripheral species. (S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Yellow-bellied Sapsucker (*Sphyrapicus varius*) / Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable**

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	12	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.7			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

This species has extended its breeding range south to NW NJ and is surprisingly numerous in the High Point/Stokes SF area. Not a species of concern in NJ due to its peripheral nesting occurrence.(S/S)

BBS data for PA and NY suggest slightly positive trends.(S/S)

Increasing but still very low numbers(SC)

Relatively recent addition to list of NJ breeding birds. NJ still at periphery of its range.(S/S)

Population seems stable or increasing for a species that only recently started breeding in the state.(S/S)

Has a good foothold in Sussex and maybe Passaic Counties and seems to be spreading. Read somewhere it is now the most common woodpecker at High Point SP. 2nd NY and PA BBAs both doubled the blocks reported since 1st Atlas efforts.(S/S)

Population increasing. (S/S)

NJ is peripheral to the main breeding range.(N/A)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Yellow-bellied Sapsucker (*Sphyrapicus varius*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable**

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	13	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.7			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Good numbers still occur at migration sites.(S/S)

I have found it in the same areas consistently for over 20 years. There are a lot of sightings on ebird.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Pileated Woodpecker (*Dryocopus pileatus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	12	0	1	0
Avg. CONF			7.0	5.5			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Positive trend in BBS data for NJ.(S/S)

Regional decline and dependence on large, mature trees(SC)

Seems to be spreading. I have seen/heard them at various locations in western Middlesex County where none were reported in the NJ BBA.

BBS data from NJ and adjacent states show increasing trends.(S/S)

Population increasing. (S/S)

Increasing. Has become very widespread and relatively common.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Pileated Woodpecker (*Dryocopus pileatus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	12	0	1	0
Avg. CONF			7.0	5.5			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

largely a localized resident(SC)

Permanent resident.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Common Raven (*Corvus corax*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	13	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			7.0	5.4			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Exploding population; now breeding in many portions of the state.(S/S)

Species is expanding in the state since the last BBS according to eBird data.(S/S)

Increasing regionally as a breeding species.(S/S)

Very small but increasing numbers(SC)

Peripheral, but a regular nester in isolated locations. (S/S)

Rapidly increasing as a breeding bird and spreading to southern counties.(S/S)

Expanding into SJ- personal observations of a pair in Whiting, NJ this summer. Many reports along the Delaware River. Multiple sightings and possible breeding in DE. (S/S)

Maybe this could have been a SC species years ago, but seems to be spreading rapidly with nests recently extending into central and south Jersey.(S/S)

population increasing(S/S)

Greatly increased. They are found in the breeding season even away from the ridges, now. I suspect a pair is regularly nesting in the Bernardsville quarry.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Common Raven (*Corvus corax*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.6			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Found even some large towns (Fairfield & Little Falls) in northern NJ in last few years.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Bank Swallow (*Riparia riparia*) / Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Special Concern**

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	13	1	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			4.9	5.0			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Agree with SC comments regarding declines.(S/S)
 Limited populations threatened by disturbance (SC)
 localized, habitat specialist and declining.(SC)
 Needs some attention as a local, sensitive breeder.(SC)
 Scattered isolated colonies, often in ephemeral habitat.(SC)
 Local, ephemeral, and prone to disturbance. Sometimes benefits from construction projects via big embankments, etc. These and other sites are worth protecting.(SC)
 Common bird in steep decline seems to warrant protection(SC)
 Species in decline and need to monitor it(SC)
 I agree with the majority that it needs monitoring.(SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Very local and prone to disturbances(SC)
 Ephemeral nature of breeding sites coupled with overall decline warrant some sort of protective status.(SC)
 As PIF notes, this is a common bird in steep decline. This seems to be the case in NJ.(SC)
 Nesting-habitat specialist in decline.(SC)
 Need to monitor this species.(SC)
 ebird has a lot of June/July sightings in the past 10 years. However, I think it needs to be monitored. Significant decrease (28%) in 2nd NY atlas.(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Species has specific habitat requirements(SC)
 eBird from last 10 years (June only) indicate a patchy distribution similar to 1990s NJ BBA, with different areas showing varied densities. This is consistent with their ephemeral nature. More data needed to get actual population trends though.(S/S)
 PIF Common bird in steep decline (PIF 2016)(SC)
 Steep declines noted in BBS in NJ, with a trend of -10.57 noted from 1966-2013. Regional trend map shows sharp declines throughout the region.(T)
 Low numbers, sensitive breeder(SC)
 Scattered isolated nesting colonies - often dependent on temporary sand banks.(SC)
 BBS data from NJ and adjacent states show decline. 2nd NY and PA BBAs show total block decline of -28% and -36%, respectively since 1980's. Decline attributed to less mining activity, modified mining practices, and flood control projects according to these BBAs.(SC)
 Common bird in steep decline (PIF 2016). 89% of population already lost with moderate threats to the breeding population. Need to keep an eye on the species. (SC)
 The BBS trend in NJ is down, but I'm not sure that Bank Swallows show up consistently on the routes. Not really sure about this one.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Bank Swallow (*Riparia riparia*) / Non-Breeding Status



Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 3 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	11	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			7.0	5.0			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Declining throughout region, not just NJ. Need to be concerned with migrant population as well. (S/S)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Nationally the species is one in decline (PIF 2016)(SC)

PIF Common bird in steep decline (PIF 2016)(SC)

Regional declines suggest the necessity of ranking; not as critical as breeding season.(S/S)

very steep declines in the Northeast(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Red-breasted Nuthatch (*Sitta canadensis*) / Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable**

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.1			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Limited habitat and breeding range(SC)

Peripheral and increasing. (S/S)

Too erratic in its occurrence to be monitored properly.(S/S)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Another species that is peripheral; but is part of the group of nesting birds that relies on conifers for breeding, including Hemlocks.(SC)

Regional trend is an increase according to BBS data.(S/S)

low numbers and limited habitat(SC)

Red-breasted Nuthatch is at best a peripheral breeding species in NJ, occasionally found in old Norway spruce plantings.(N/A)

A recent colonizer? Both 2nd NY and PA BBAs show many more blocks reported over 1st Atlas effort.(U/U)

population increasing(S/S)

Something of a peripheral breeding species in NJ. Erratic in its occurrence.(N/A)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Brown Creeper (*Certhia americana*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	13	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			7.0	4.8			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Similar to BLBW BTBW BTNW RBGR (SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Limited habitat and breeding range(SC)

Shows a local range, distribution similar to other birds such as Blackburnian, Black-throated Green, and Black-throated Blue Warblers.(SC)
peripheral and increasing. (S/S)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Another species whose breeding status may be related to the health of Hemlocks and other coniferous trees. Worth monitoring.(SC)

Slight positive trend in BBS data (trend of +2.61 from 1966-2013), though regional trend map shows some regional declines as well.(S/S)
low numbers and limited habitat(SC)

Very small numbers breed in the very northern part of the state.(SC)

Considering SC for this as eBird suggests a current state range more in line with other birds that mainly occur along the Kittatinny Ridge and northern Highlands.(U/U)

population increasing(S/S)

Somewhat limited breeding range in the state but I consider NJ on the periphery of its range. Ebird in June July for the past 10 years shows that the distribution is similar to the atlas project, but with possibly a slight contraction.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Brown Creeper (*Certhia americana*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	13	0	1	0
Avg. CONF				5.5			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

population increasing(S/S)

Common in its historic haunts during the winter.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Golden-crowned Kinglet (*Regulus satrapa*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	13	1	0	0
Avg. CONF				4.9			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Peripheral and if a beneficiary of Norway spruce groves, perhaps not warranting SC like other specialist birds of the Kittatinny and Highlands. (U/U)
stable population in the East and considered a boreal forest bird - NJ on extreme periphery(S/S)
A peripheral, relatively new breeding species in NJ. 2nd NY atlas showed a 13% increase.(N/A)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Probably secure for now, but climate change could change this. NJ isn't essential for this bird's breeding success; didn't nest in the state until the 1970s when Norway Spruce groves matured.(S/S)
low-density breeder in the extreme north of the state.(SC)
Some positive trends in the southern edge of its regional breeding range.(S/S)
Golden-crowned Kinglet is a peripheral breeding species in NJ, generally found only in old Norway spruce plantings.(N/A)
Recent summer observations of GCKI breeding in the northern/central part of the state. Tied to conifer forests- deforestation can severely hinder their ability to stay here.(SC)
I am going with SC if only to be consistent with other specialist birds of the Kittatinny Ridge and Valley and northern Highlands.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Golden-crowned Kinglet (*Regulus satrapa*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	13	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			6.0	5.6			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Bird is showing non-significant but negative population trend nation-wide (PIF 2016). In irruptive years can winter in large numbers through NJ. (S/S)
Very abundant bird, slight population declines overall but stable/increasing in the east.(S/S)
Common migrant.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Hermit Thrush (*Catharus guttatus*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	13	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			7.0	4.6			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

No comments received.

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Low numbers, limited habitat(SC)

If Veery warrants SC, surely Hermit Thrush does too.(SC)

I'm on the fence between SC and S, but 2nd NY atlas showed a substantial 31% increase. There are not too many ebird sightings in NJ during June-July the past 10 years, though.(S/S)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Probably breeds in Pine Barrens; still does along dry ridges in the Kittatinny Ridge area.(U/U)

Slightly positive regional trend from BBS maps.(S/S)

low numbers and limited habitat(SC)

Population declines as a breeder in the state, but low numbers to begin with.(SC)

Least common of the nesting brown thrushes. Similar range to other species that mainly occur only in the Kittatinny Ridge and Valley and northern Highlands. Scarce breeders in Pinelands, too.(SC)

population stable overall, increasing in east(S/S)

Very limited breeding range in the state.(SC)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Hermit Thrush (*Catharus guttatus*) / Non-Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 2 Votes

NB. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
Avg. CONF				5.5			

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Common in migration and also, at times, during the winter.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Northern Waterthrush (*Parkesia noveboracensis*) / Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable**

Summary of Round 3 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	10	0	1	0
Avg. CONF			4.0	5.0			

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Somewhat limited range but seems to be holding its own. 2nd NY atlas showed a slight increase.(S/S)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Peripheral species at southern edge of range. Still present at traditional sites in the NW corner of the state.(S/S)

based on NJ BBA and eBird this species appears to be increasing as a breeder in NJ.(S/S)

Slight negative BBS trend (-2.36) for NJ and trend map shows regional declines too.(SC)

low numbers and limited habitat(SC)

Has a distribution similar to other birds that mainly nest in the Kittatinny Ridge and Valley and Northern Highlands. 2nd NY and PA BBAs show declines of -37% and -17% in number of confirmed blocks.(SC)

Population increasing overall. (S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Magnolia Warbler (*Setophaga magnolia*) / Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Not Reached**

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	7	0	0	6
Avg. CONF			5.0	4.9			5.0

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

SS or N/A works for me.(S/S)

Switch from N/A to S/S to try for consensus. Peripheral breeding species that seems to be increasing elsewhere.(S/S)
peripheral species(S/S)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Low numbers, limited habitat(N/A)

As a peripheral species, it should be recognized as native. (S/S)

According to ebird it may be increasing in the state as it is in NY.(N/A)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Another peripheral species; habitat it nests at is worthy of protection.(SC)

Regional BBS data suggest declines in SE NY and increases in NE PA. Unclear.(S/S)

low numbers and limited habitat(SC)

Magnolia Warbler is a peripheral breeding species in NJ. Probably doesn't nest in state every year.(N/A)

Seems to have increased west of NJ, but declined north and east.(U/U)

Bird is approaching its southern limit in NJ. Not many confirmed breeding records. Consistently found not far away in NY and PA, where numbers are increasing.(N/A)

Population increasing(S/S)

NJ is on the periphery of the breeding range.(N/A)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Yellow-rumped Warbler (*Setophaga coronata*) / Breeding Status

☐ **Consensus Reached: Not Applicable**

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Avg. CONF							4.8

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

SS or N/A.(N/A)

Or S/S if it still annual breeder but doubt it. Peripheral in breeding occurrence and abundant still. (N/A)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

I'm not even sure if this species still nests in NJ, but we've always been at the periphery and the species is still very common to our north.(N/A)

NJ is at the very limit of their range.(N/A)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Always at the southern limit of its range, this species may disappear as a breeder in NJ, but is still common to our north.(N/A)

may be declining as suitable habitat shifts north. Already a very low density breeder.(U/U)

Slight positive regional BBS trends.(S/S)

Another bird at the southern limit of its nesting range. Isolated nesting records.(N/A)

Like Magnolia Warbler, this species breeding range hardly reaches NJ at all.(N/A)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Swamp Sparrow (*Melospiza georgiana*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Secure/Stable

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	1	13	0	0	0
Avg. CONF			7.0	4.8			

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

I mistakenly put S/S last time. This is a declining population (distinct subspecies or taxon) within the species. I firmly think SC is needed and warranted. Near the coast it is a high salt marsh and brackish habitat indicator that is in recent sharp decline like Saltmarsh Sparrow. (SC)

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

Decline seems evident, particularly in the south(SC)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

Declining as a breeder in brackish/freshwater marshes.(SC)

BBS declines (1966-2013 trend of -4.13) in NJ; coastal plain breeders seem to be disappearing rather quickly.(SC)

Coastal Plain population is especially in decline(SC)

Still common breeder in appropriate habitat, especially in northern part of the state(S/S)

They've decline in NJ while increasing elsewhere, which may eventually make this species SC, but I seem to find them where I expect to.(S/S)

NJ BBS indicates decreasing trend. 2nd NY and PA BBAs show +6% and +32% increase, respectively, in total blocks reported over 1st Atlas. (S/S)

Overall population is increasing but declining in NJ. Still regularly abundant in NJ to not warrant listing at this time. (S/S)

ebird sightings during June & July for the past 10 years look similar to the NJ Atlas from the 1990's with the exception of the Delaware Bay shore. They seem to have disappeared from that area.(S/S)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.

Species Status Assessment: Land Birds 2016 -2017

Dark-eyed Junco (*Junco hyemalis*) / Breeding Status

☐ Consensus Reached: Not Applicable

Summary of Round 4 Votes

BR. STATUS	E	T	SC	S/S	U/U	N/O	N/A
#VOTES	0	0	0	1	0	0	13
Avg. CONF				5.0			5.4

Summary of Round 4 Justification Comments

Dark-eyed Junco is a peripheral breeding species in NJ, occasionally along the top of Kittatinny Ridge. Probably does not nest every year.

Summary of Round 3 Justification Comments

If it does nest in NJ with any regularity, it should be recognized as native. (S/S)

Nj is at the periphery of its breeding range and the species seems to be doing well in the region.(N/A)

Summary of Round 2 Justification Comments

such a scarce breeder, if at all anymore(N/A)

Mix of regional declines and increases according to BBS trend maps, but seems to be declining over much of the range.(U/U)

Dark-eyed Junco is a peripheral breeding species in NJ, occasionally along the top of Kittatinny Ridge. Probably does not nest every year.(N/A)

NJ is at south edge of breeding range. Occasional breeder in NW NJ.(N/A)

NJ is at the periphery of its breeding range. The second NY state atlas showed a healthy increase.(N/A)

Summary of Round 1 Justification Comments

This species was added by panelist request following Round 1.