American Golden-Plover

Pluvialis dominica

Review Status: Peer-reviewed

Version Date: 09 February 2018

Conservation Status

NatureServe: Agency:

G Rank: G5

S Rank: S5B

ADF&G: Species of Greatest Conservation Need **IUCN: Least Concern USFWS**: BLM: Watch

Final Rank					
Conservation category: V. Orange unknown status and either high biological vulnerability or high action need					
<u>(</u>	Category	Range	Score		
S	Status	-20 to 20	0		
I	Biological	-50 to 50	-33		
l l	Action	-40 to 40	12		
Higher numerical scores denote greater concern					

Status - variables measure the trend in a taxon's population status or distribution. Higher status scores denote ta known declining trends. Status scores range from -20 (increasing) to 20 (decreasing).	xa with Score
Population Trend in Alaska (-10 to 10)	0
Unknown for Alaska. Suspected to be declining in eastern North America (Andres et al. 2012	2a).
Distribution Trend in Alaska (-10 to 10)	0
Unknown.	
St	atus Total: 0

Biological - variables measure aspects of a taxon's distribution, abundance and life history. Higher biological scores suggest greater vulnerability to extirpation. Biological scores range from -50 (least vulnerable) to 50 (most vulnerable). Score Population Size in Alaska (-10 to 10) -10 >25,000. The size of the Alaskan breeding population is estimated at 282,249 (95% CI: 116,287-448,211) (Bart and Smith 2012, qtd. in Andres et al. 2012a). Range Size in Alaska (-10 to 10) -10 Widely distributed in Alaska. Breeds from the central Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta north to the North Slope and east to the Canadian border (Johnson et al. 2018a). A disjunct population also breeds in southwestern Alaska north of Lake Clark National Park (Bennett 1996; Johnson et al. 2018a). Estimated breeding range >400,000 sq. km. Overwinters in South America. -10

Population Concentration in Alaska (-10 to 10)

In most cases, individuals are dispersed on the landscape and are only seen singly or in small groups

Class: Aves Order: Charadriiformes

Audubon AK:Red

(Kessel 1989; Gill and Handel 1990; Taylor et al. 2010; Yezerinac et al. 2013). However, individuals can concentrate in large numbers during migration (Kessel 1989; Clay et al. 2010). For example, 1,000 individuals have been observed in the Mendenhall Wetlands in southeast Alaska during migration (Clay et al. 2010). Other sites that support high concentrations of birds have not been identified. Given the plover's large range, large population size, and comparatively small group size, the number of sites is likely >250. We therefore rank this question as D.

Reproductive Potential in Alaska

Age of First Reproduction (-5 to 5)

May be able to breed in their first year (like the Pacific golden-plover, Pluvialis fulva), but data are lacking (Johnson et al. 2018a).

Number of Young (-5 to 5)

Typically lays one 4-egg clutch per year (Kessel 1989; Yezerinac et al. 2013; Johnson et al. 2018a; Weiser et al. 2018a). A clutch containing fewer than four eggs probably indicates partial depredation or a replacement clutch (Johnson et al 2018a). Replacement laying in this species and in Pacific Golden-Plover has been documented (see Johnson et al. 2008d; Naves et al. 2008).

Ecological Specialization in Alaska

Dietary (-5 to 5)

Few data are available for Alaska. On breeding grounds, feeds mainly on terrestrial insects, but also on freshwater and marine invertebrates, and berries (Kessel 1989; Johnson et al. 2018a).

Habitat (-5 to 5)

Breeds on the tundra on dry, well-drained lowlands and uplands including slopes, hills, and ridges (Kessel 1989; Johnson et al. 2007a; Liebezeit et al. 2011; Johnson et al. 2018a). Vegetation is usually sparse and low-lying e.g. grasslands, dwarf-shrub meadows, and rocky slopes (Kessel 1989; Bennett 1996; Johnson et al. 2001b; Johnson et al. 2018a). After breeding, they move to wetter habitats such as moist dwarf-shrub tundra, tidal flats, salt marshes, and estuaries (Kessel 1989; Taylor et al. 2010; Johnson et al. 2018a).

Biological Total: -33

0

1

-5

1

Action - variables measure current state of knowledge or extent of conservation efforts directed toward a given taxon. Higher action scores denote greater information needs due of lack of knowledge or conservation action. Action scores range from -40 (lower needs) to 40 (greater needs). Score Management Plans and Regulations in Alaska (-10 to 10) -10 Protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA 1918). Closed to recreational and subsistence harvesting (ADFG 2018e; AMBCC 2018). 2 Knowledge of Distribution and Habitat in Alaska (-10 to 10) Distribution and habitat associations are well-known in northern Alaska (e.g. Johnson et al. 2001b; Brown et al. 2007; Johnson et al. 2007a; Liebezeit et al. 2011; Andres et al. 2012b; Saalfeld et al. 2013b; Cunningham et al. 2016), but less understood in southwestern and interior Alaska (Bennett 1996; Johnson et al. 2018a). During migration, this species has been reported from Yakutat (Andres and Browne 1998), upper Cook Inlet (Gill and Tibbits 1999), the central YKD (Gill and Handel 1990), and the Arctic coast (Taylor et al. 2010). However, additional data are needed to identify migration patterns, including important stop-over and staging sites.

Knowledge of Population Trends in Alaska (-10 to 10)

There is currently no monitoring program in place in Alaska that can provide data on population trends. Recent efforts such as PRISM surveys are promising, but this program is still in its infancy

2

10

and multi-year trend data are not available (Bart et al. 2012). Until such data become available, we rank this question as A- Not currently monitored.

Knowledge of Factors Limiting Populations in Alaska (-10 to 10)

Little is known about the factors that limit population dynamics. While some data on survival rates are available, the factors influencing survival are unknown. As a proxy for annual survival, return rates of 57% and 80% have been reported for the North Slope and the Seward Peninsula, respectively (Moitoret et al. 1996, qtd. in Johnson et al. 2001b; Johnson et al. 2001b), but no further data are available. Hunting and habitat loss on migration and overwintering grounds may pose a threat, but additional data are needed (Clay et al. 2010; Watts et al. 2015; Reed et al. 2018a). With respect to reproductive success, Weiser et al. (2018b) estimated a nest survival rate of 52% on breeding grounds across the Alaskan and Canadian Arctic. Clutch size and daily nest survival showed no relationship to temperature, timing of snowmelt, or abundance of foxes or small mammals (Weiser et al. 2018b). In another study, nest survival was also not related to nest re-use by adults and additional studies are needed to determine whether nest sites are limited (Herzog et al. 2018). Although organic and inorganic contaminants have been detected in eggs, levels are not thought to have an adverse effect on individuals or populations (Saalfeld et al 2016), with the possible exception of mercury (Perkins et al. 2016).

Action Total: 12

Supplemental Information - variables do not receive numerical scores. Instead, they are used to sort taxa to answer specific biological or management questions.

Harvest:	None or Prohibited
Seasonal Occurrence:	Breeding
Taxonomic Significance:	Monotypic species
% Global Range in Alaska:	>10%
% Global Population in Alaska:	25-74%
Peripheral:	No

References

Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG). 2020c. 2020-2021 Migratory game bird hunting regulations summary. Anchorage, AK, USA.

Andres, B. A., and B. T. Browne. 1998. Spring migration of shorebirds on the Yakutat Forelands, Alaska. The Wilson Bulletin 110(3):326–331.

Andres, B. A., P. A. Smith, R. G. Morrison, C. L. Gratto-Trevor, S. C. Brown, and C. A. Friis. 2012a. Population estimates of North American shorebirds, 2012. Wader Study Group Bulletin 119(3):178-194.

Andres, B. A., J. A. Johnson, S. C. Brown, and R. B. Lanctot. 2012b. Shorebirds breed in unusually high densities in the Teshekpuk Lake Special Area, Alaska. Arctic 65(4):411–420. DOI: 10.14430/arctic4239

Alaska Shorebird Group (ASG). 2019. Alaska Shorebird Conservation Plan, Version III. Alaska Shorebird Group, Anchorage, AK, USA. Available online: <u>https://www.fws.gov/alaska/mbsp/mbm/shorebirds/plans.htm</u>

Bart, J., S. Brown, B. A. Andres, R. Platte, and A. Manning. 2012. North Slope of Alaska. Pages 37-96 in J. Bart and V. Johnston, eds. Arctic shorebirds in North America: A decade of monitoring. Studies in Avian Biology No. 44, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, USA.

Bennett, A. J. 1996. Pacific and American golden-plovers breeding in southwestern Alaska. Northwestern Naturalist 77(2):49–51. DOI: 10.2307/3536621

10

Brown, S., J. Bart, R. B. Lanctot, J. A. Johnson, S. Kendall, D. Payer, and J. Johnson. 2007. Shorebird abundance and distribution on the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The Condor 109(1):1–14. DOI: 10.1650/0010-5422(2007)109[1:SAADOT]2.0.CO;2

Clay, R. P., A. J. Lesterhuis, and O. Johnson. 2010. Conservation plan for the American golden-plover (Pluvialis dominica) version 1.1. Manomet Center for Conservation Sciences, Manomet, MA, USA.

Cunningham, J. A., D. C. Kesler, and R. B. Lanctot. 2016. Habitat and social factors influence nest-site selection in Arcticbreeding shorebirds. The Auk 133(3):364–377. DOI: 10.1642/AUK-15-196.1

Gill, R. E., Jr., and C. M. Handel. 1990. The importance of subarctic intertidal habitats to shorebirds: A study of the central Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta, Alaska. The Condor 92(3):709-725.

Gill, R. E., Jr., and T. L. Tibbitts. 1999. Seasonal shorebird use of intertidal habitats in Cook Inlet, Alaska. Final report MMS 99-0012. U. S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division and OCS Study, Anchorage, AK, USA.

Herzog, P., S. T. Saalfeld, H.-H. Kaatz, and R. B. Lanctot. 2018. Nest reuse in arctic-breeding shorebirds: An analysis of potential benefits and factors affecting the occurrence of this rare behavior. Journal of Avian Biology 49(7):e01737. DOI: 10.1111/jav.01737

Johnson, O. W., P. L. Bruner, A. E. Bruner, P. M. Johnson, R. J. Kienholz, and P. A. Brusseau. 2001b. Features of breeding biology in Pacific and American golden-plovers nesting on the Seward Peninsula, Alaska. Wader Study Group Bulletin 95:59–65.

Johnson, J. A., R. B. Lanctot, B. A. Andres, J. R. Bart, S. C. Brown. S. J. Kendall, and D. C. Payer. 2007a. Distribution of breeding shorebirds on the Arctic Coastal Plain of Alaska. Arctic 60(3):277-293. DOI: 10.14430/arctic220

Johnson, O. W., R. H. Goodwill, R. S. Gold, and P. M. Johnson. 2008d. Clutch replacement and between-clutch mate fidelity of Pacific golden-plovers Pluvialis fulva breeding near Nome, Alaska. Wader Study Group Bulletin 115(3):157–160.

Johnson, O. W., P. G. Connors, and P. Pyle. 2018a. American golden-plover (Pluvialis dominica), version 3.0. In Rodewald, P. G., ed. The Birds of North America. Cornell Lab of Ornithology, Ithaca, NY, USA. DOI: 10.2173/bna.amgplo.03

Kessel, B. 1989. Birds of the Seward Peninsula, Alaska: Their biogeography, seasonality, and natural history. University of Alaska Press, Fairbanks, AK, USA.

Liebezeit, J. R., G. C. White, and S. Zack. 2011. Breeding ecology of birds at Teshekpuk Lake: A key habitat site on the Arctic Coastal Plain of Alaska. Arctic 64(1):32–44. DOI: 10.14430/arctic4078

Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). 1918. U.S. Code Title 16 §§ 703-712 Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

Naves, L. C., R. B. Lanctot, A. R. Taylor, and N. P. Coutsoubos. 2008. How often do Arctic shorebirds lay replacement clutches? Wader Study Group Bulletin 115(1):2–9.

Perkins, M., L. Ferguson, R. B. Lanctot, I. J. Stenhouse, S. Kendall, S. Brown, H. R. Gates, J. O. Hall, K. Regan, and D. C. Evers. 2016. Mercury exposure and risk in breeding and staging Alaskan shorebirds. The Condor 118(3):571–582. DOI: 10.1650/CONDOR-16-36.1

Reed, E. T., K. J. Kardynal, J. A. Horrocks, and K. A. Hobson. 2018a. Shorebird hunting in Barbados: Using stable isotopes to link the harvest at a migratory stopover site with sources of production. The Condor 120(2):357–370. DOI: 10.1650/CONDOR-17-127.1

Saalfeld, S. T., R. B. Lanctot, S. C. Brown, D. T. Saalfeld, J. A. Johnson, B. A. Andres, and J. R. Bart. 2013b. Predicting breeding shorebird distributions on the Arctic Coastal Plain of Alaska. Ecosphere 4(1):1–17. DOI: 10.1890/ES12-00292.1

Saalfeld, D. T., A. C. Matz, B. J. McCaffery, O. W. Johnson, P. Bruner, and R. B. Lanctot. 2016. Inorganic and organic contaminants in Alaskan shorebird eggs. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 188(5):1–7. DOI: 10.1007/s10661-016-5270-y

Taylor, A. R., R. B. Lanctot, A. N. Powell, F. Huettmann, D. A. Nigro, and S. J. Kendall. 2010. Distribution and community characteristics of staging shorebirds on the northern coast of Alaska. Arctic 63(4):451–467. DOI: 10.14430/arctic3334

Watts, B. D., E. T. Reed, and C. Turrin. 2015. Estimating sustainable mortality limits for shorebirds using the Western Atlantic Flyway. Wader Study 122(1):37–53. DOI: 10.18194/ws.00005

Weiser, E. L., S. C. Brown, R. B. Lanctot, H. R. Gates, K. F. Abraham, R. L. Bentzen, ..., and B. K. Sandercock. 2018a. Lifehistory tradeoffs revealed by seasonal declines in reproductive traits of Arctic-breeding shorebirds. Journal of Avian Biology 49(2):e01531. DOI: 10.1111/jav.01531

Weiser, E. L., S. C. Brown, R. B. Lanctot, H. R. Gates, K. F. Abraham, R. L. Bentzen, ..., B. K. Sandercock. 2018b. Effects of environmental conditions on reproductive effort and nest success of Arctic-breeding shorebirds. Ibis 160(3):608–623. DOI: 10.1111/ibi.12571

Yezerinac, S., R. B. Lanctot, G. K. Sage, and S. L. Talbot. 2013. Social and genetic mating system of the American goldenplover. The Condor 115(4):808–815. DOI: 10.1525/cond.2013.120081

Alaska Center for Conservation Science Alaska Natural Heritage Program University of Alaska Anchorage Anchorage, AK