

Summary of Southeastern Group Breakout Sessions

Bob Ford¹ and Charles P. Nicholson²

The breakout sessions held by the southeastern representatives at the *Partners In Flight* meeting in Colorado were extremely well attended. Most states were represented, as well as several federal agencies (including USFS, USFWS, TVA, EPA), and non-government organizations. Two sessions were held, one to discuss a strategy of management by physiographic province, the other to discuss integrated management approaches.

The first session was held to discuss the species prioritization scheme for physiographic provinces in the southeast and to transfer to a strategy for formulation of habitat management opportunities (as developed by Hunter and Pashley in the southeast and published in these proceedings). There was general agreement that the strategy was fundamentally good and workable for public land managers. Topics of discussion included 1) need for specific stand management options for groups of species, 2) better integration of migratory bird recommendations into existing management guidelines for game species, and 3) permanent funding source to pay for active management and monitoring programs.

Physiographic province coordinators within the Southeastern Management Working Group were identified and introduced to the group. The agenda and topics for the southeastern meeting in Memphis, Tennessee this November were discussed.

As a further topic of concern, Breeding Bird Survey results need to be used carefully for guiding management by resource professionals, but not to exaggerate population declines to imply a "crisis" situation. It was generally agreed that use of "statistically significant" is not always appropriate, but use of the terms "definite declines" (significant) and "possible declines" (non-significant) would be generally understood by both professionals and lay people.

The second session was held to discuss potential management options for conservation of neotropical migrants and impacts of various silvicultural practices on these species. The group generally agreed that, for some areas where commercial timber production on a rigid rotation is a top priority, the best management may be relatively large clear cuts as opposed to a group selection approach with many small patch cuts. This may be recommended considering that the same amount of timber is to be harvested regardless of forestry practices used, that migrants requiring early successional habitats may be area sensitive as are forest interior species, and that the longevity of interior forest roads will be shorter using clear cuts when compared with group selection, where such roads will be more numerous and permanent. However, there was a general consensus that specific recommendations will vary between physiographic provinces and among forest types depending on local land management objectives.

¹ Tennessee Conservation League, 300 Orlando Ave., Nashville, Tennessee 37209.

² Tennessee Valley Authority, 17 Ridgeway Road, Norris, Tennessee 37828.