

APPENDIX A

EIGHT REQUIRED ELEMENTS & REVISION GUIDELINES FOR INCORPORATING CLIMATE CHANGE

The Nevada Wildlife Action Plan authoring and revision process has been guided by several documents provided to the states by a working group of U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies staff members. These documents, as captured in the following sections, contain the requirements for the original drafting of the state Wildlife Action Plan, plan revision strategies, and guidance on integrating climate change into management plans, including the Wildlife Action Plan.

Original Eight Required Elements for State Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategies (AFWA 2002)

1. Information on the distribution and abundance of species of wildlife, including low and declining populations as each State fish and wildlife agency deemed appropriate, that are indicative of the diversity and health of wildlife of the State; (In subsequent discussions, these species were referred to as Species of Greatest Conservation Need or SGCN.)
2. Information on the location and relative condition of key habitats and community types essential to the conservation of each State's SGCN;
3. Descriptions of the problems which may adversely affect SGCN or their habitats, and priority research and surveys needed to identify factors which may assist in restoration and improved conservation of SGCN and their habitats;
4. Descriptions of the actions necessary to conserve SGCN and their habitats and establishes priorities for implementing such conservation actions;
5. Descriptions of the provisions for periodic monitoring of SGCN and their habitats, for monitoring the effectiveness of conservation actions, and for adapting conservation actions as appropriate to respond to new information or changing conditions;
6. Each State's provisions to review its Strategy at intervals not to exceed ten years;
7. Each State's provisions for coordination during the development, implementation, review, and revision of its Strategy with Federal, State, and local agencies and Indian Tribes that manage significant areas of land or water within the State, or administer programs that significantly affect the conservation of species or their habitats; and
8. Each State's provisions to provide the necessary public participation in the development, revision, and implementation of its Strategy.

Guidance for Wildlife Action Plan Review and Revisions

(USFWS and AFWA, July 2007)

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to identify the process and requirements that all States/territories must utilize for the future review and revision of their Wildlife Action Plans (Action Plans).

Introduction

The Action Plans were developed by the States to be dynamic, adaptive documents that would guide agency and partner conservation planning for years to come. Each State committed to reviewing or, if necessary, revising (review/revise) their Action Plan within 10 years as per Element 6 of the original legislation. Many States committed to do so at much shorter intervals.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), encourages States to review and revise their plans as often as is useful to them and their partners. Recent Congressional report language indicates that Congress expects the USFWS to develop guidance/standards that will be utilized by all States/territories to revise their action plans. The Congress also expects that USFWS will apply the standards consistently in all Regions. (cf. Senate Report 109-275: Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2007. House Report 109-465: Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2007). This guidance document will ensure national consistency while allowing States and their partners' flexibility to update their Action Plans without undue burden.

Review Process

Original plan review, with approval recommendations to the Director of the USFWS was provided by a National Advisory Acceptance Team (NAAT) -- the Assistant Director of Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration, each of the seven USFWS Assistant 2 Regional Directors for Migratory Birds and State Programs (ARD), Assistant Manager (AM) of the California/Nevada Office, a representative State Director from each regional Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (AFWA), and a representative of the national AFWA organization. Although a NAAT may be reconvened in the future to consider general policy matters or particularly complex review/revision issues, it is not anticipated that a NAAT will evaluate Action Plan review/revisions. Instead, that task will be accomplished by Regional Review Teams (RRTs). The RRTs were an integral part of the original Action Plan evaluation process and we feel that future evaluations of Action Plan review/revisions will be carried out more effectively using this regional approach.

There will be eight RRTs, one within each FWS region. The RRTs are comprised of one ARD, AM or equivalent; and one State Director appointed by each of the four regional associations (e.g. Southeastern, Midwest, Northeast, and Western). State Directors serving on RRTs will not evaluate the Action Plan from their own agency. In such cases, the Action Plan would be sent to another RRT for review. Federal Assistance Program and State staff may assist the RRTs as necessary. RRTs will assist States with guidance on Action Plan revisions and be available for any Action Plan related issues that may arise

General Requirements

All States must review/revise their Action Plans by October 1, 2015, or the date specified in their original,

approved Action Plan and send the updated version and summary documentation to the USFWS. This summary documentation must demonstrate that the entire Action Plan was examined and that all of the original Eight Required Elements (attached) were met, including an up-to-date public review process specified in Elements 7 and 8. If no changes were made, the State must document and explain why no changes were necessary and what process was used to make that determination. For more details, see Section A. Once Action Plan review/revisions are approved, States are not obligated to review/revise their Action Plans for another 10 years or until a date specified in the Action Plan. A State may also revise only a part of its Action Plan without reviewing/revising its entire Action Plan. Some Action Plan revisions, including but not limited to the addition of a species, are defined as “major” (see definition on page 5). As such, States must provide documentation that demonstrates all of the original Eight Required Elements are adequately addressed, including an up-to-date public review process as specified in Elements 7 and 8. “Major” revisions must follow the requirements outlined in Section B. All other revisions are considered “minor” and must follow the requirements outlined in Section C.

Specific Requirements

Section A.

Requirements for Planned Review/Revision of Entire Plan

- (1) State agency director notifies its Regional USFWS Federal Assistance office by letter of intent to review or revise the Action Plan.
- (2) State and USFWS meet to discuss guidance to ensure all elements will be addressed prior to submission of documentation and reviewed/revise Action Plan.
- (3) State submits reviewed/revise Action Plan package by October 1, 2015, or the date specified in its original, approved Action Plan to the Regional Federal Assistance office.

This package will include:

- summary of any significant changes and documentation describing how the current version of Action Plan adequately addresses the Required Eight Elements, including an up-to-date public review process specified in Elements 7 and 8;
 - “Road map” (summary of location of elements in document) to locate revisions in Action Plan.
- (4) States are encouraged to post an electronic version of their most recent Action Plan on the web along with the summary of significant changes and “road map.”
 - (5) RRT reviews Action Plan with input from Federal Assistance staff and determines whether it is approvable or not approvable. The ARD or AM will send a letter to the State Director with documentation of the decision and description of any required action if the Action Plan is not approvable. State Directors can appeal to the Regional Director.
 - (6) ARDs and AM are responsible for communicating significant issues with members of all the RRTs to ensure consistency among RRTs.
 - (7) States that specified a review/revision within 10 years (prior to the October 1, 2015, deadline) in their Action Plan and wish to change that date must submit a “minor” revision letter (see Section C below) to their Regional Federal Assistance office.

- (8) Federal Assistance must track revisions and due dates and maintain an administrative record of Action Plan revisions.

Section B.

Requirements for “Major” Revisions Prior to the Planned Review/Revision Date

- (1) State agency director notifies its Regional FWS Federal Assistance office by letter of intent to make “major” revisions to the Action Plan (See definition below).
- (2) State submits modified Action Plan and includes:
 - summary of all significant revisions;
 - documentation describing how the revision meets the Required Eight Elements, including an up-to-date public review process specified in Elements 7 and 8;
 - “road map” to locate revisions in Action Plan.
- (3) States are encouraged to post an electronic version of their most recent Action Plan on the Web with the summary of significant changes and “road map.”
- (4) RRT reviews Action Plan with input from Federal Assistance staff and determines whether it is approvable or not approvable. The ARD or AM will send a letter to the State Director with documentation of the decision and description of any required action if the Action Plan is not approvable. State Directors can appeal to the Regional Director.
- (5) ARDs and AM are responsible for communicating significant issues with members of all the RRTs to ensure consistency among RRTs.
- (6) Federal Assistance must track these revisions and maintain an administrative record of Action Plan revisions.

Section C.

Requirements for “Minor” Revisions Prior to the Planned Review/Revision Date

- (1) State Director notifies the Regional FWS Federal Assistance office by letter of intent to make minor revisions with a description of the change and why the change is considered a minor revision.
- (2) State submits letter that includes:
 - summary of all revisions;
 - “road map” to locate revisions in Action Plan.
- (3) States are encouraged to post an electronic version of their most recent Action Plan on the web along with the summary of significant changes and “road map” (summary of location of elements in document).
- (4) Federal Assistance must track these revisions and maintain an administrative record of Action Plan revisions.

Definitions

“Major”: A significant change or changes that requires revision of two or more elements in the Action Plan. Any addition of a species of greatest conservation need (SGCN) would be a major revision. This is considered a major revision because it would require the State to substantially address subsequent elements (i.e., habitats, threats, actions). Similarly, a revision of its threat assessments for SGCN species and/or habitats that are essential to conservation of SGCN would be a major change because it would likely result in changes to conservation actions and prioritization of those conservation actions.

“Minor”: All revisions not considered “major”.

The RRT will determine if a change is minor or major when it is unclear. This decision may be requested by either the State or staff of Federal Assistance. State Directors can appeal decisions to the Regional Director.

Note that States and other eligible jurisdictions that wish to use State Wildlife Grant (SWG) funds to address critical priority issues not identified within an Action Plan should refer to the USFWS *2007 Administrative Guidelines for State Wildlife Grants* (SWG Guidelines), *Section X.H.*

Voluntary Guidance for States to Incorporate Climate Change into State Wildlife Action Plans & Other Management Plans (Excerpted from AFWA 2009)

This chapter includes a review and summary of existing guidance on Wildlife Action Plans and describes how climate change may reshape the original eight required elements. Congress required that state fish and wildlife agencies develop a Wildlife Action Plan as a condition for receiving State Wildlife Grant funding. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies have provided guidance on the development, approval, implementation and revision of Wildlife Action Plans and the expenditure of State Wildlife Grant funds to assist states in carrying out this mandate. The most recent guidance was a letter by the Director of the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the President of the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies regarding requirements for plan revision (2007 FWS/AFWA Revision Guidance Letter). Additional guidance may be included in future appropriation or climate change legislation. States should review their Wildlife Action Plans to determine the timeframe for required revisions. States may opt to revise their plan before they are required to do so.

Existing Guidance Documents That Were Reviewed:

1. Congressional Legislation – Required 8 Elements (2000)
2. AFWA Guiding Principles White Paper (2002)
3. AFWA Guidance Binder (2003)
4. NAAT One Year Out Guidance (2004)
5. FWS/AFWA Revision Guidance Letter (2007)
6. Draft 2 521 FWS State Wildlife Grant Chapter (2007)

Wildlife Action Plans were organized according to eight elements required by Congress. Each of these required elements must be addressed during a major revision of a Wildlife Action Plan. Following is a review of the eight required elements and suggestions to consider when revising your Wildlife Action Plans to better incorporate climate change:

Climate Change Implications by Element

Element 1: *Information on the distribution and abundance of species of wildlife, including low and declining populations as the state fish and wildlife agency deems appropriate, that are indicative of the diversity and health of the state's wildlife.*

According to the *AFWA Guiding Principles White Paper (2002)*, Wildlife Action Plans should address the broad range of wildlife and associated habitats, as well as combine landscape/ecosystem/habitat-based approaches and smaller-scale approaches (e.g. focal, keystone, and/or indicator species; guilds; species of special concern) for planning and implementation. The *AFWA Guidance Binder (2003)* provides specific criteria for the evaluation of species for inclusion as a species in greatest need of conservation. Many of those criteria may need to be reevaluated in the context of climate change, including criteria for the following categories: globally rare species; declining species; endemic species; disjunct species; vulnerable species; small, localized populations; species with limited dispersal; species with fragmented or isolated populations; species of special conservation concern; focal species; keystone species; wide ranging species; species with specific needs; indicator species; responsibility species (i.e. species that have their center of range within a state) and species that rely on concentration areas (e.g. migratory stopover sites, bat roosts/maternity sites). The evaluation should describe how and why a state's species in greatest conservation need (SGCN) list priorities will change as a result of the evaluation.

Climate Change Considerations:

- States should consider reexamining their SGCN list and make changes to account for current and future impacts of climate change. It may be necessary to specifically examine the likely effects of climate change on species with very low and declining populations. Climate change may significantly change the abundance of many wildlife species (including species which were not considered to be SGCN).
- States should consider the implications for range changes in recovery efforts of SGCN species. Climate change may significantly change the distribution of many wildlife species (including species not currently considered SGCN).
- States may need to reconsider their definitions/lists for native, exotic and invasive species.
- State's should consider using their revision process as an opportunity to address the needs of species groups not currently addressed in their Wildlife Action Plan (e.g. marine species, plants). If there are jurisdictional barriers states may want to show how those species are being addressed by other agencies of jurisdiction.
- States should consider using vulnerability assessments as a tool for identifying and describing the impacts of climate change on species. Vulnerability assessments can help states plan for new threats associated with climate change and those that might be exacerbated by climate change.
- States should consider using species-based models that can incorporate both direct and indirect effects of climate change on survival, reproduction and other life history factors. For example temperature changes may lead to increased severe weather events that affect survival or reproductive capacity of migratory species.

- States should consider using vulnerability assessments to consider how climate change influences populations outside of a state’s border.

Element 2: *Information on the location and relative condition of key habitats and community types essential to the conservation of each state’s SGCN.*

Revision of Element 2 for climate change should address the broad range of habitats associated with SGCN. Both landscape and smaller scale approaches should be considered (AFWA Guiding Principles White Paper, 2002). Spatially explicit information such as GIS-produced maps can be a useful tool for describing habitat conditions and location and can be used by the agency and partners to guide conservation work and inform land-use decision-making (AFWA Guiding Principles 2002). If possible, the revision process should consider habitats/biotic communities that serve as “umbrellas” for species assemblages. A habitat/vegetation approach can improve efficiency in managing for multiple species and serve as a way to conserve all species, including common and game species (AFWA Guidance Binder, 2003). Climate change revisions should consider the scale required for effective conservation of habitats in the face of a changing climate and suggest coordination processes for conservation at effective scales (NAAT One Year Out Guidance, 2004).

Climate Change Considerations:

- States should consider acquiring information on how habitats and communities are likely to change as a result of climate change (i.e. use scenario-building processes).
- States should consider how climate change will affect the future abundance and distribution of habitat types as well as changes in structure and physical characteristics.
- States should consider the implications of the appearance of novel (no-analog) communities as vegetation responds to changing climate.
- States should strive to identify the location and condition of priority landscapes and smaller site-specific habitats that may not be easily mapped but are important now or in the future to SGCN (e.g. seasonal habitats).
- States should consider that climate change will likely affect the extent and condition of habitats and community types at various spatial and temporal scales.
- States should consider using vulnerability assessments as a tool for identifying and describing the impacts of climate change on key habitats.

Element 3: *Descriptions of problems which may adversely affect species identified in (1) or their habitats, and priority research and survey efforts needed to identify factors which may assist in restoration and improved conservation of these species and their habitats.*

Revision of Element 3 will require that states examine the full range of issues, including non-wildlife factors that have substantial impact on wildlife conservation (AFWA Guiding Principles White Paper, 2002). Wildlife Action Plans should address issues at the state level and coordinate with parallel efforts in other states and countries (AFWA Guiding Principles White Paper, 2002). Threats analyses (or other comparable methodology) should be used to set goals and priorities and should identify knowledge gaps for future study (AFWA Guiding Principles 2002).

Climate Change Considerations:

- States should consider climate change as a new problem for species and habitats, including potential direct and indirect impacts (e.g. sea level rise, invasive species, disease, snowpack extent and duration and increased number and severity of floods, droughts and wildfires).
- States should consider reviewing current threats, problems, or impacts affecting wildlife through a climate lens and treat climate change as both a new and exacerbating threat.
- States should consider using vulnerability assessments to identify and prioritize threats.
- States should consider the impacts of fragmentation and land use to fish and wildlife movement as a barrier to wildlife adaptation across the landscape.
- States should consider using methodology that “steps down” global climate models to the state level so that the impacts of climate change can be better understood at scales that are useful for decision-making and management at the state scale.
- States should consider partnering with adjacent states or regions to identify and implement priority research and survey needs both within and across state border.
- States should consider using research and monitoring to identify how habitats or plant communities may change in response to climate change and how those changes influence conservation of SGCN.
- States should consider using research to understand which vital rates or life history characteristics are influenced by climate change (survival, reproductive capacity, foraging, etc.).

Element 4: Descriptions of conservation actions determined to be necessary to conserve the identified species and habitats and priorities for implementing such actions.

Revision of Element 4 will require that states describe the conservation actions needed to address identified threats to SGCN and their habitats. Identification and prioritization of actions should involve all relevant partners and consider various approaches at appropriate state, regional and national scales (AFWA Guiding Principles White Paper, 2002). Actions should make full use of existing information, identify knowledge gaps and incorporate techniques such as vulnerability assessments to set priorities (AFWA Guiding Principles White Paper, 2002). Wildlife Action Plans should be a driving force in guiding activities under diverse wildlife and habitat conservation initiatives and should include all needed actions regardless of funding source or state wildlife agency capacity (AFWA Guiding Principles White Paper, 2002; NAAT One Year Out Guidance, 2004). Conservation actions should be described sufficiently to guide implementation of those actions through development and execution of specific projects and programs.

Climate Change Considerations:

- States should consider developing conservation actions that specifically address the direct and indirect impacts of climate change on species and their habitats over a wide range of likely future climate conditions.

- States should consider identifying/describing how conservation actions will be prioritized in consideration of multiple threats/stresses and increased uncertainty.
- States should consider identifying which actions are intended to minimize climate change impacts, which will provide for wildlife adaptation, which will provide for resilience and/or which will facilitate movement to suitable habitats and conditions.
- States should consider identifying decision points or thresholds for actions that are designed to: 1) recognize that some species will go extinct despite our best efforts; and 2) minimize imminent loss of habitats and species.
- States should consider including the identification, protection and maintenance of key corridors to improve connectivity as a key action to help wildlife adapt to climate change.
- States should consider linking conservation actions to specific objectives and indicators that will facilitate monitoring, performance measurement and changes or improvements to actions through adaptive management.
- States should consider conservation actions that benefit the greatest number of SGCN and other more common and economically important species (e.g. game species).

Element 5: *Descriptions of the proposed plans for monitoring species identified in Element 1 and their habitats, for monitoring the effectiveness of the conservation actions proposed in Element 4, and for adapting these conservation actions to respond appropriately to new information or changing conditions.*

Revision of Element 5 will require that states identify proposed monitoring plans. When developing or adapting monitoring efforts for incorporation of climate change, states should base their Wildlife Action Plans in the principles of “best science,” “best management practices,” and “adaptive management,” with measurable goals, objectives, strategies, approaches and activities that are complete, realistic, feasible, logical and achievable (AFWA’s Guiding Principles White Paper, 2002). Wildlife Action Plans should describe the proposed plans for monitoring species and their habitats and the effectiveness of the conservation actions taken, with attention given to adapting conservation actions to new information and changing conditions (AFWA Guidance Binder 2003). While all states addressed and included monitoring plans in their approved Wildlife Action Plans, most did not address or include monitoring specifically for climate change impacts or adaptation. States should consider how existing monitoring plans can or should be modified to address climate change or if climate change monitoring should be considered independently.

Climate Change Considerations:

- States should consider increasing monitoring effort to better inform adaptive management, which is of increased importance in responding to climate change.
- States should consider increasing monitoring effort to evaluate management decisions which will become increasingly complex because of the uncertainty of climate change.
- States should strive to use the most streamlined, affordable, scalable and broadly applicable monitoring methods available.
- States should consider new collaborations with other states, NGO’s, citizen scientist

organizations etc. to improve species and habitat monitoring across entire ranges and regions.

Element 6: *Each State's provisions to review its strategy at intervals not to exceed ten years.*

Revision of Element 6 will require that states identify the timeframe for future plan revisions. The *AFWA Guiding Principles White Paper, 2002* recommended that Wildlife Action Plans include review procedures that ensure the plans are dynamic and can be improved and updated efficiently as new information is obtained. The *NAAT One Year Out Guidance (2004)* states that additions and changes to Wildlife Action Plans should be identified as part of the "element guide" and where appropriate demonstrates the linkages between changes in the elements. For example, a change in the SGCN list (Element 1) might require reprioritization of the actions necessary to conserve species and/or their habitats (Element 2). According to the *FWS/AFWA Revision Guidance Letter (2007)* all states should review/revise their Action Plans by October 1, 2015, or by the date specified in their approved Action Plan. Many states are currently revising their Wildlife Action Plan or may be doing so in the future to better incorporate climate change.

The *FWS/AFWA Revision Guidance Letter (2007)* instructs that states contact their Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration State Wildlife Grant Specialist in their USFWS regional office for guidance at the outset of their revision process. If a state included only a brief mention of climate change, then the state may make a request of the Service to include climate change as an emerging issue. The request should be made as a letter to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service describing the emerging issue and committing the state to a thorough discussion of the climate change in the next scheduled revision of their Wildlife Action Plan. States planning to revise their Wildlife Action Plans to more fully incorporate climate change should refer to the *FWS/AFWA Revision Guidance Letter (2007)* in the Appendix to determine if a revision will be considered "major" or "minor" and to ensure the proper steps are followed.

Element 7: *Each State's provisions for coordination during the development, implementation, review, and revision of its Strategy with Federal, State, and local agencies and Indian Tribes that manage significant areas of land or water within the State, or administer programs that significantly affect the conservation of species or their habitats.*

Revision of Element 7 will require that states describe how they will coordinate with partner organizations. Coordination is encouraged, especially for border states and states where such coordination is needed for successful conservation of SGCN (*NAAT One Year Out Guidance, 2004*). Many efforts are underway by state agencies, federal agencies and private conservation organizations to plan for climate change. In addition, there is rapid growth in the volume of information becoming available about climate change including vulnerability assessment, wildlife adaptation and research and monitoring. Coordination with partners will help ensure that state fish and wildlife agencies can use and distribute information on climate change in an efficient and effective manner.

Climate Change Considerations:

- States should consider involving/collaborating with partners (e.g. agencies, private conservation organizations, tribes, etc.) early during the revision process to ensure effective communication and sharing of information, expertise and resources.
- States should consider involving/coordinating with partners due to the uncertainty of climate change and the importance of coordinating management at large ecologically meaningful scales.

- States with coastal resources should consider collaborating with marine-oriented partners, particularly those states without full jurisdiction over marine species.

Element 8: *Each State's provisions to provide the necessary public participation in the development, revision, and implementation of its Strategy.*

Public participation is the process of inviting and involving the public in decision-making to promote trust, accountability and transparency. It serves the public interest, can lead to improved decision-making and helps to identify and recruit new constituencies. Public participation is a discipline and there are many sources of information, training, expertise and case studies available to assist with the process.

Public participation can be accomplished through advisory committees, public meetings, town halls, forums, polling, open houses, workshops, focus groups public comment periods, social networking, etc. The International Association of Public Participation is a good source of information and their public participation spectrum can help categorize major stakeholder roles in the public participation process. AFWA's Guiding Principles White Paper (2002) made a number of recommendations related to public participation including the importance of documenting decision points, involving partners early in the process and using traditional (e.g. public meetings) and technological innovations (e.g. internet polling) to engage the public. The Plan Revision Guidance Letter (2007) stated that "a major revision of a Wildlife Action Plan will require that states address element eight and provide an up to date public review process." The letter also stated that "states are encouraged to post an electronic version of their most recent Action Plan on the web along with the summary of significant changes and "road map."

The AFWA Guidance Binder (2003), made the following suggestions related to public participation. Agency capacity for leading a public participation process should be assessed and those leading the process should be experienced and well trained. Where capacity is lacking, professionals outside the agency should be utilized. Objectives for public involvement should be determined during the early stages of planning and be based on agency and public needs or requirements. These needs or requirements may change over time, which may require a change in objectives. It is important to anticipate controversies so relevant information can be acquired in advance of public meetings. Potential triggers can be defused by framing the planning process in terms that reduce the risks of public misunderstanding or intentional misrepresentation. The plan's purposes should be linked to established community values (e.g. bird watching, fishing, economic development, quality of life), existing conservation efforts should be acknowledged and the voluntary nature of the plan should be emphasized. Language should be direct and honest and it should be understood that the most involved or outspoken people may be opinion leaders but may not be indicative of the public at large. Including such people in the process is essential, but their viewpoints should be corroborated. Past experiences in public participation (good and bad) can serve as a guide for new processes.

Climate Change Considerations:

- States should consider using public participation planning processes because of the complexity and potential for controversy associated with climate change.
- States should take advantage of resources (e.g. PowerPoint presentations) available from states and partners that can be useful in helping the public understand the science and impacts of climate change on wildlife.
- States should recognize that there are a variety of positions on climate change even among

those who value wildlife. Controversy associated with policies to reduce greenhouse gasses (e.g. cap and trade protocol) should be separated from the necessity to immediately address the impacts of climate change to wildlife.

- States should consider choosing terms that are appropriate and if possible tested with your constituency groups. For example, the term “safeguarding wildlife” has been shown to be more readily understood by the public than “adaptation”.
- States should consider involving conservation partners early during the public participation planning process, but recognize there may not be agreement on messages or approaches.

References

Eight Required Elements for State Wildlife Action Plans. Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies. 2002.

http://www.wildlifeactionplans.org/pdfs/eight_elements_handout.pdf

Guidance for Wildlife Action Plan (Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy) Review and Revisions. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies. July 2007.

<http://wsfrprograms.fws.gov/subpages/toolkitfiles/NAATgde.pdf>

Voluntary Guidance for States to Incorporate Climate Change into State Wildlife Action Plans & Other Management Plans. Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies. September 2009.

http://www.fishwildlife.org/files/AFWA-Voluntary-Guidance-Incorporating-Climate-Change_SWAP.pdf