

[1] "[Tringa glareola](#) — Wood Sandpiper

[Glossary](#) [SPRAT Profile](#)

For information to assist regulatory considerations, refer to Policy Statements and Guidelines, the Conservation Advice, the Listing Advice and/or the Recovery Plan. [EPBC Legal Status and Documents](#) [Top](#) [EPBC Act Listing Status](#) [Listed marine](#) [Listed migratory](#) - [EPBC Act](#), [Bonn](#), [CAMBA](#), [JAMBA](#), [ROKAMBA](#) [Approved Conservation Advice](#) There is no approved Conservation Advice for this species [Listing Advice](#) There is no Listing Advice for this species [Adopted/Made Recovery Plans](#) There is no adopted or made Recovery Plan for this species [Adopted/Made Threat Abatement Plans](#) No Threat Abatement Plan has been identified as being relevant for this species [Wildlife Conservation Plans](#) [Commonwealth of Australia \(2015\)](#). Wildlife Conservation Plan for Migratory Shorebirds. Canberra, ACT: Department of the Environment. Available from: <http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/publications/wildlife-conservation-plan-migratory-shorebirds-2016>. In effect under the EPBC Act from 15-Jan-2016. [Other Commonwealth Documents](#) [Top](#) [Other EPBC Act Plans](#) [EPBC Act Policy Statement 3.21 - Industry Guidelines for avoiding, assessing and mitigating impacts on EBBC Act listed migratory shorebird species \(Department of the Environment, 2015\) \[Admin Guideline\]](#). [National Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife Including Marine Turtles, Seabirds and Migratory Shorebirds \(Department of the Environment and Energy, 2020\) \[Admin Guideline\]](#). [Shorebirds - A Vulnerability Assessment for the Great Barrier Reef \(Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority \(GBRMPA\), 2011\) \[Admin Guideline\]](#). [Information Sheets](#) [Migratory Shorebirds of the East Asian - Australasian Flyway: Population estimates and internationally important sites \(Bamford M., D. Watkins, W. Bancroft, G. Tischler & J. Wahl, 2008\) \[Information Sheet\]](#). [Revision of the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Population Estimates for 37 listed Migratory Shorebird Species \(Hansen, B.D., R.A. Fuller, D. Watkins, D.I. Rogers, R.S. Clemens, M. Newman, E.J. Woehler & D.R. Weller, 2016\) In effect under the EPBC Act from 29-May-2017. \[Information Sheet\]](#). [Federal Register of Legislative Instruments](#) [Marine:Declaration under section 248 of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 - List of Marine Species \(Commonwealth of Australia, 2000c\) \[Legislative Instrument\]](#) [Migratory:List of Migratory Species \(13/07/2000\) \(Commonwealth of Australia, 2000b\) \[Legislative Instrument\]](#) [Wildlife Conservation Plan:Wildlife Conservation Plan for Migratory Shorebirds \(Commonwealth of Australia, 2006r\) \[Legislative Instrument\]](#) [Wildlife Conservation Plan:Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 - Section 285 - Instrument revoking and making a wildlife conservation plan \(Commonwealth of Australia, 2016\) \[Legislative Instrument\]](#) [State Listing Status](#) [SA:](#) [Listed as Rare](#) (National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 (South Australia): Rare species: January 2020 list) [Non-statutory Listing Status](#) [IUCN:](#) [Listed as Least Concern](#) (Global Status: IUCN Red List of Threatened Species: 2020.2 list) [VIC:](#) [Listed as Vulnerable](#) (Advisory List of Threatened Vertebrate Fauna in Victoria: 2013 list) [NGO:](#) [Listed as Least Concern](#) (The Action Plan for Australian Birds 2010 - non-threatened) [Naming](#) [Top](#) [Scientific name](#) [Tringa glareola](#) [829] [Family](#) [Scolopacidae:Charadriiformes:Aves:Chordata:Animalia](#) [Species author](#) [Linnaeus,1758](#) [Infraspecies author](#) [Reference](#) [Distribution Map](#) [Top](#) [Distribution map](#) The distribution shown is generalised from the Departments Species of National Environmental Significance dataset. This is an indicative distribution map of the present distribution of the species based on best available knowledge. Some species information is withheld in line with sensitive species polices. See map caveat for more information. [Illustrations](#) [Top](#) [Illustrations](#) [Google Images](#) [Other Links, Including](#)

associate freely with other waders and often feed in scattered groups. They are wary, nervous and excitable, particularly in flocks, although solitary birds will sometimes tolerate close approach (Higgins & Davies 1996).

Australian Distribution

The Wood Sandpiper has its largest numbers recorded in north-west Australia, with all areas of national importance located in Western-Australia (Watkins 1993):

- Parry Floodplain (Wyndham), 355
- Camballin, 185
- Lake Argyle, 90
- Shark Bay area, 80
- Vasse-Wonnerup estuary, 61
- Lake McLarty, 64
- Kogolup Lakes, 60.

In Queensland there are sparsely scattered records, generally south of 17° S, but also around Cairns. In NSW there are records east of the Great Divide, from Stratheden and Casino, south to Nowra and elsewhere, mostly from the Riverina, but also from the Upper and Lower Western Regions. In Victoria most sightings occur around Port Phillip Bay and in the mid-Murray Valley from around Cohuna to Kooloonong. There are scattered records elsewhere include Corner Inlet, Portland, Heywood and the wetlands in the Northern and Wimmera Regions, and in the Mildura district. The species is rarely seen in Tasmania. In South Australia most records occur east of the line from south Eyre Peninsula through Old Nilpinna to Purnu Bore, with most occurring south of 33° S on the Yorke Peninsula, Adelaide Plains, Murray Mallee and south-east regions. In Western Australia the species is widespread but scattered in most regions. In the Northern Territory they are found at the Top End, scattered from Keep River, south and east to the Victoria River Downs and Crocodile Billabong and Ngukurr, and to Kakadu National Park and Darwin. In southern Northern Territory they are found mostly around Alice Springs. They have also been recorded on Christmas Island and Prince Edward Island (Higgins & Davies 1996).

Global Distribution

Top

Non-breeding distribution

Most of the Flyway population spends non-breeding season in South-East Asia. Breeding distribution

The Wood Sandpiper breeds across Eurasia, mostly in Scandinavia, the Baltic countries and Russia. It rarely breeds in Iceland, Scotland, and western Europe. In Russia (where the breeding distribution is continuous with Scandinavia) the Wood Sandpiper breeds west to around headwaters of Pripyat River in Minsk region. The southern breeding boundary extends from there, around 51-53° N, through Kazakhstan, around the upper Irtysh River, south Transbaikalia, through northern Mongolia and north-west Heilungkiang (north-east China), upper Amur River to the Udsakaya Gulf. The eastern boundary extends from the Udsakaya Gulf, north-east along the coast to Kamchatka and the Chukotskiy Peninsulas; occasionally they nest on the west and central Aleutian Isles. The northern boundary ranges from c. 68° N on the Chukotskiy Peninsula to c. 71° N around Yeniseyskiy, but dips south to the Arctic Circle around the south Obskaya Gulf, and north again to c. 70° N on the Yogorskiy Peninsula; thence round the coastline (except the north Kanin Peninsula) to the Kolskiy Peninsula. Most spend the non-breeding period in Africa, mostly south of the line between south-west Mauritania, the confluence of Nile Rivers and Somalia, with a few staying in the north, some also occur along the Nile River valley. There are scattered records on Arabian Peninsula, around the Red Sea, Gulf of Aden and the Persian Gulf. They occur throughout most of the Indian subcontinent, to Indomalaya and south-east Asia and north-east through Indochina and the Philippines to south and east China. In Australasia, there are scattered in New Guinea, between Waigeu Island, Vogelkop and Wissel Lakes in Irian Jaya. Paupa New Guinea they are found mostly in the south but also from Bensbach River in the south-west, around Madang and on Bougainville. The Wood Sandpiper is not recorded New Zealand. The species is a passage migrant through the Mediterranean, Tibet, northern China, Korean Peninsula, Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong and west Micronesia. Vagrants have been recorded on islands in Atlantic Ocean, Portugal, Alaska, Hawaii, Barbados and New York (Marchant & Higgins 1993).

Population Information

Top

Population

An estimated 130 000 Wood Sandpipers occupy the East Asian-Australasian Flyway (Hansen et al. 2016). The Global population is estimated at 3 055 000–4 320 000 (Bamford et al. 2008). Sites of international importance and there populations are listed below (Bamford et al. 2008)

Site	Country	Max Count
Daursky Nature Reserve	Russia	20 000
Yancheng National Nature Reserve	China	3515
Dongsha Islands	China	3515
Wasan Rice Scheme	Brunei	3114
Papar	Malaysia	2551
Lake Evoron	Russia	1578
Kharchinskoe Lake	Russia	1314
Haizhouwan (Taipei Saltworks)	China	1251
Nong Han Kumphawapi	Thailand	1000
Lososei Bay	Russia	500
Yalu Jiang National Nature Reserve	China	490
Shuangtaizihekou N. N. Reserve	China	454
Kahokugata	Japan	300
North-west Bo Hai Wan	China	295

Trends

The Wood Sandpiper is not globally threatened, but the breeding population had declined in some European countries, e.g. Finland, Sweden, Germany and Poland (del Hoyo et al. 1996). In Australia, this species showed no change between atlases 20 years apart (Barrett et al. 2002). The species is uncommon or rare in Victoria where no change in status was detected (Wilson 2001a).

Habitat

Top

Typical habitat \nThe Wood Sandpiper uses well-vegetated, shallow, freshwater wetlands, such as swamps, billabongs, lakes, pools and waterholes. They are typically associated with emergent, aquatic plants or grass, and dominated by taller fringing vegetation, such as dense stands of rushes or reeds, shrubs, or dead or live trees, especially Melaleuca and River Red Gums Eucalyptus camaldulensis and often with fallen timber. They also frequent inundated grasslands, short herbage or wooded floodplains, where floodwaters are temporary or receding, and irrigated crops. They are also found at some small wetlands only when they are drying. They are rarely found using brackish wetlands, or dry stunted saltmarsh. Typically they do not use coastal flats, but are occasionally recorded in stony wetlands. This species uses artificial wetlands, including open sewage ponds, reservoirs, large farm dams, and bore drains (Higgins & Davies 1996). In Western Australia, within wetlands, birds often occur within a few metres of one another and are concentrated at a few sites in a wetland (Higgins & Davies 1996).

Habitat for feeding \nThe Wood Sandpiper forages on moist or dry mud at the edges of wetlands, either along shores, among open scattered aquatic vegetation, or in clear shallow water (Higgins & Davies 1996).

Habitat for roosting \nThe Wood Sandpiper has been recorded loafing on a low, grassy hillock in a flooded meadow. It as also been recorded perched low in trees and on fences (Higgins & Davies 1996).

Life Cycle

The Wood Sandpiper does not breed in Australia. Within the breeding range, the species is solitary, normally 1\u009610 pairs/km² but up to 50 birds/km² in forest tundra. The nest is a scrape on the ground amongst dense cover and is usually lined with moss, stems and leaves. The species also sometimes nests in the old nests of other species in trees. The Wood Sandpiper lays eggs from May to mid-July. They usually lay four eggs, sometimes three, and are only single brooded. Incubation lasts 22\u009623 days with fledging at 28\u009630 days. The annual adult mortality is 46% with first-year mortality at 83\u009688%. The oldest recorded banded bird was 9 years, 2 months. The age of first breeding is one year (del Hoyo et al. 1996).

Feeding

The Wood Sandpiper is carnivorous, eating mainly insects and molluscs in Australia (Higgins & Davies 1996). Elsewhere the species also eats seeds, algae, worms, crustaceans, arachnids, fish and frogs (Cramp & Simmonds 1983). On breeding grounds the Wood Sandpiper eats mainly adult and larval midges, as well as seeds (del Hoyo et al. 1996). The species wades in shallow fresh water, often up to belly, gleaning prey from the surface of the water (Hindwood & McGill 1953). They are known to probe, sometimes with head and neck submerged, and sweep the bill from side to side under water (Higgins & Davies 1996).

Movement Patterns

Migration patterns \nThe Wood Sandpiper is migratory species that breeds throughout Eurasia, mainly between 50° N and 70° N. The non-breeding areas are mainly in tropical and subtropical Africa, south Asia to south China, Philippines, Indonesia and Australia. It has been suggested that the Australian non-breeding population probably breeds in eastern Siberia (Blakers et al. 1984). Within Australia, some movements are dispersive (Higgins & Davies 1996).

Departure from breeding grounds \nThe Wood Sandpiper appears to migrate through near-coastal parts of east Asia and down major river valleys in south Asia. They leave the Kamchatka Peninsula, east Siberia, by early September and pass through south Ussuriland from August\u0096late-September. The species is transient in Japan, with greater numbers on sothern migration. They are a common passage migrant in Korea from September\u0096October and move through north China and Tibet. Large numbers move through east China passing through north-east Chihli from the start of August to early September and through the Foochow Valley in September\u0096October. They are passage migrants in Hong Kong between late August and early October. They first arrive in Taiwan in August. The Wood sandpiper is abundant in Burma from August and are a common visitor to Thailand, where maximum numbers occur from September and in the south, as late as January. They pass through Malaysia, Singapore and Sumatra; also Christmas Island, Brunei, Borneo, Wallacea, Philippines and west Micronesia. The species arrives in Australia and New Guinea from August, when they are first recorded in the north and the interior; in Darwin they often arrive in flocks of up to 60 birds that soon disperse (Higgins & Davies 1996).

Non-breeding\nThis species is the most abundant migratory shorebird in non-coastal areas of Asia, but only a small proportion of the Asian population reaches Australia and movements within Australia are poorly known (Lane 1987). Most Australian records are in August\u0096April (Hindwood & McGill 1953). After their arrival, some move south across the continent; they are regular at Mt Isa district, Queensland, from August, with possible onward movement in August\u0096September. A peak in numbers occurs in Alice Spings, Northern Territory, throughout September (Thomas 1970b). They do not move south down the east coast (e.g. Amiet 1957). They arrive later at near-coastal sites in the south (e.g. at Werribee, Victoria), where small numbers generally arrive in November \u0096December (Lane 1987), and in the County of Northumberland, NSW, from November (Morris 1975b).The species is common in south-west Western Australia, from summer to autumn (Higgins & Davies 1996). In Australia they are regular at many sites, but

also apparently dispersive and appear erratically in summer at storm pools inland (Higgins & Davies 1996). Return to breeding grounds
 The Wood Sandpiper leaves Werribee, Victoria, from March\u0096April, though single birds are recorded as late as May (Lane 1987). A peak in numbers occurs at Alice Springs, Northern Territory, in March (Thomas 1970b). The species is not recorded in Darwin after 26 April, (Crawford 1972) but is present at Mt Isa, Queensland, till early May (Thomas 1970b). A few pass through New Guinea in March until early May (Hicks 1990). In Wallacea, no dated records appear after April (White & Bruce 1986). They are known to pass through Sumatra, south-west Brunei, Burma, Malaysia, Vietnam, Taiwan, Korea, Hong Kong, east China and north-east Chihli (Higgins & Davies 1996). They arrive in the eastern breeding grounds from May (Dement'ev & Gladkov 1951). Only a few birds winter in Australia (Blakers et al. 1984). Reasons for migration
 Southward migration is to escape severe winter conditions and consequent high energy demand and low prey availability; northward migration is to breeding grounds where food is temporarily superabundant during Northern Hemisphere summer. The evolution of these migrations is poorly understood. Migratory pathways and important sites
 Almost certainly occur in the Yellow Sea in significant concentrations and intensive surveying of suitable habitat might lead to this species being recorded in internationally important numbers there (Barter 2002).

Threats
 Top
 Global threats
 There are a number of threats that affect migratory shorebirds in the East Asian-Australasian Flyway. The greatest threat is indirect and direct habitat loss (Melville 1997). Staging areas used during migration through eastern Asia are being lost and degraded by activities which are reclaiming the mudflats for development or developing them for aquaculture (Barter 2002, 2005c; Ge et al. 2007; Round 2006). This is especially evident in the Yellow Sea, where at least 40% of intertidal areas have been reclaimed. This process is continuing at a rapid rate and may accelerate in the near future (Barter 2002, 2005c). For example, in South Korea, the Mangyeung and Dongjin River estuaries each supported 5% of the combined estimated Flyway populations (and are the most important sites for this species on both northern and southern migration) but they are currently being reclaimed as part of the Saemangeum Reclamation Project (Barter 2002, 2005c). The 33 km sea-wall across these two estuaries was completed in April 2006, resulting in significant change in the 40 100 ha area.
 Reclamation is also a threat in other areas of the Flyway, such as in Malaysia (Wei et al. 2006). In addition, water regulation and diversion infrastructure in the major tributaries have resulted in the reduction of water and sediment flows (Barter 2002; Barter et al. 1998).
 Migratory shorebirds are also adversely affected by pollution, both on passage and in non-breeding areas (Harding et al. 2007; Melville 1997; Round 2006; Wei et al. 2006).
 Disturbance from human activities, including recreation, shellfish harvesting, fishing and aquaculture is likely to increase significantly in the future (Barter et al. 2005c; Davidson & Rothwell 1993).
 It is predicted that the rate of decrease in the intertidal area in the Yellow Sea will accelerate (Barter 2002). In addition, intensive oil exploration and extraction, and reduction in river flows due to upstream water diversion, are other potentially significant threats in parts of China where this species is present in internationally significant numbers (Barter 2005c; Barter et al. 1998).
 Global warming and associated changes in sea level are likely to have a long-term impact on the breeding, staging and non-breeding grounds of migratory waders (Harding et al. 2007).
 Hunting is still a very serious problem for waders in China, and this species is sometimes caught (Ming et al. 1998).
 Threats within Australia
 Within Australia, there are a number of threats common to most migratory shorebirds, including the Wood Sandpiper. Habitat loss
 The loss of important habitat reduces the availability of foraging and roosting sites. This affects the ability of the birds to build up the energy stores required for successful migration and breeding. Some sites are important all year round for juveniles who may stay in Australia throughout the breeding season until they reach maturity. A variety of activities may cause habitat loss. These include direct losses through land clearing, inundation, infilling or draining. Indirect loss may occur due to changes in water quality, hydrology or structural changes near roosting sites (DEWHA 2009aj).
 Habitat degradation
 As most migratory shorebirds have specialized feeding techniques, they are particularly susceptible to slight changes in prey sources and foraging environments. Activities that cause habitat degradation (DEWHA 2009aj) include, but are not restricted to:
 loss of marine or estuarine vegetation, which is likely to alter the dynamic equilibrium of sediment banks and mudflats
 invasion of intertidal mudflats by weeds such as cord grass
 water pollution and changes to the water regime
 changes to the hydrological regime
 exposure of acid sulphate soils, hence changing the chemical balance at the site.
 Disturbance
 Disturbance can result from residential and recreational activities including; fishing, power boating, four wheel driving, walking dogs, noise and night lighting. While some disturbances may have only a low impact it is important to consider the combined effect of disturbances with other threats. Roosting and foraging birds are sensitive to discrete, unpredictable disturbances such as loud noises (i.e. construction sites) and approaching objects (i.e. boats). Sustained disturbances can prevent shorebirds from using parts of the habitat (DEWHA 2009aj). Direct

mortality\nDirect mortality is a result of human activities around the migration pathways of shorebirds and at roosting and foraging sites. Examples include the construction of wind farms in migration or movement pathways, bird strike due to aircraft, hunting, chemical and oil spills (DEWHA 2009aj).\n\n Threat Abatement and Recovery\n\n Top\n\n Governments and conservation groups have undertaken a wide range of activities relating to migratory shorebird conservation (AGDEH 2005c) both in Australia and in cooperation with other countries associated with the East Asian-Australasian Flyway.\nAustraliaThe Wildlife Conservation Plan for Migratory Shorebirds (AGDEH 2006f) outlines national activities to support flyway shorebird conservation initiatives and provides a strategic framework to ensure these activities and future research and management actions are integrated and remain focused on the long-term survival of migratory shorebird populations and their habitats.\nSince 1996\009697, the Australian Government has invested approximately \$5 000 000 of Natural Heritage Trust (NHT) funding in projects contributing to migratory shorebird conservation (DEWHA 2007e). This funding has been distributed across a range of important projects, including the implementation of a nationally coordinated monitoring programme that will produce robust, long-term population data able to support the conservation and effective management of shorebirds and their habitat; migration studies using colour bands and leg flags; and development of a shorebird conservation toolkit to assist users to develop and implement shorebird conservation projects.\nBirds Australia is currently co-ordinating the Shorebirds 2020 project, which aims to monitor shorebird populations at important sites throughout Australia; and Birdlife International is identifying sites and regions which are important to various species of birds, including shorebirds, and the processes that are affecting them. The aim is to inform decisions on the management of shorebird habitat. It may be possible to rehabilitate some degraded wetlands or to create artificial wader feeding or roosting sites to replace those destroyed by development, such as by creating artificial sandflats and sand islands from dredge spoil and by building breakwaters (Dening 2005; Straw 1992a, 1999).\n\nThe Significant impact guidelines for 36 migratory shorebirds Draft EPBC Act Policy Statement 3.21 (DEWHA 2009aj) provides guidelines for determining the impacts of proposed actions on migratory shorebirds. The policy statement also provides mitigation strategies to reduce the level and extent of those impacts.\n\nAustralia has played an important role in building international cooperation to conserve migratory birds. In addition to being party to international agreements on migratory species, Australia is also a member of the Partnership for the Conservation of Migratory Waterbirds and the Sustainable Use of their Habitats in the East Asian-Australasian Flyway (Flyway Partnership), which was launched in Bogor, Indonesia on 6 November 2006. Prior to this agreement, Australia was party to the Asia-Pacific Migratory Waterbird Conservation Strategy and the Action Plan for the Conservation of Migratory Shorebirds in the East Asian-Australasian Flyway and the East Asian-Australasian Shorebird Site Network.\n\nThe East Asian-Australasian Flyway Site Network, which is part of the broader Flyway Partnership, promotes the identification and protection of key sites for migratory shorebirds. Australia has 17 sites in the network (Partnership EAAF 2008):Kakadu National Park, Northern Territory (1 375 940 ha)\nParry Lagoons, Western Australia (36 111 ha)\nThomsons Lake, Western Australia (213 ha)\nMoreton Bay, Queensland (113 314 ha)\nHunter Estuary, NSW (2916 ha)\nCorner Inlet, Victoria (51 500 ha)\nThe Coorong, Lake Alexandrina & Lake Albert, South Australia (140 500 ha)\nOrielton Lagoon, Tasmania (2920 ha)\nLogan Lagoon, Tasmania (2320 ha)\nWestern Port, Victoria (59 297 ha)\nPort Phillip Bay (Western Shoreline) and Bellarine Peninsula, Victoria (16 540 ha)\nShallow Inlet Marine and Coastal Park, Victoria\nDiscovery Bay Coastal Park, Victoria\nBowling Green Bay, Queensland\nShoalwater Bay, Queensland\nGreat Sandy Strait, Queensland\nCurrawinya National Park, Queensland. \n\n Management Documentation\n\n Top\n\n The Department's Wildlife Conservation Plan for Migratory Shorebirds (AGDEH 2006f), the Background Paper to the Wildlife Conservation Plan for Migratory Shorebirds (AGDEH 2005c) and The Action Plan for Australian Birds (Garnett & Crowley 2000) also contain actions aimed at the conservation of migratory birds within Australia.\n\nThe Significant impact guidelines for 36 migratory shorebirds Draft EPBC Act Policy Statement 3.21 (DEWHA 2009aj) provides guidelines for determining the impacts of proposed actions on migratory shorebirds. The policy statement also provides mitigation strategies to reduce the level and extent of those impacts.\n\n Species Profile References\n\n Top\n\n Amiet, L. (1957). A wader survey of some Queensland coastal localities. *Emu*. 57:236-254.\n\n Australian Government Department of the Environment and Heritage (AGDEH) (2005c). Background Paper to the Wildlife Conservation Plan for Migratory Shorebirds. Canberra, ACT: Department of the Environment and Heritage. Available from: <http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/migratory/publications/pubs/shorebird-plan-background.pdf>. \n\n Australian Government Department of the Environment and Heritage (AGDEH) (2006f). Wildlife

Conservation Plan for Migratory Shorebirds. Canberra, ACT: Department of the Environment and Heritage. Available from: <http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/migratory/publications/shorebird-plan.html>. In effect under the EPBC Act from 25-Feb-2006. Ceased to be in effect under the EPBC Act from 15-Jan-2016.

Bamford M., D. Watkins, W. Bancroft, G. Tischler & J. Wahl (2008). Migratory Shorebirds of the East Asian - Australasian Flyway: Population estimates and internationally important sites. Canberra, ACT: Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts, Wetlands International-Oceania. Available from: <http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/migratory/publications/shorebirds-east-asia.html>.

Barrett, G., A. Silcocks, R. Cunningham & R. Poulter (2002). Comparison of Atlas 1 (1977-1981) and Atlas 2 (1998-2001): Supplementary Report No. 1. Melbourne: Birds Australia, report for Natural Heritage Trust.

Barter, M.A. (2002). Shorebirds of the Yellow Sea: Importance, Threats and Conservation Status. Wetlands International Global Series No. 8, International Wader Studies 12. Canberra, ACT: Wetlands International.

Barter, M.A. (2005c). Yellow Sea-driven priorities for Australian shorebird researchers. In: Straw, P., ed. Status and Conservation of Shorebirds in the East Asian-Australasian Flyway. Proceedings of the Australasian Shorebirds Conference 13-15 December 2003, Canberra, Australia. Sydney, NSW: Wetlands International Global Series 18, International Wader Studies 17.

Barter, M.A., D. Tonkinson, J.Z. Lu, S.Y. Zhu, Y. Kong, T.H. Wang, Z.W. Li & X.M. Meng (1998). Shorebird numbers in the Huang He (Yellow River) Delta during the 1997 northward migration. *Stilt*. 33:15-26.

Blakers, M., S.J.J.F. Davies & P.N. Reilly (1984). The Atlas of Australian Birds. Melbourne, Victoria: Melbourne University Press.

Cramp, S. & K.E.L. Simmons, eds. (1983). Handbook of the Birds of Europe, the Middle East and North Africa. The Birds of the Western Palearctic. Volume 3, Waders to Gulls. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crawford, D.N. (1972). Birds of Darwin area, with some records from other parts of Northern Territory. *Emu*. 72:131-48.

Davidson, N. & P. Rothwell (1993). Disturbance to waterfowl on estuaries. *Wader Study Group Bulletin*. 68.

del Hoyo, J., A. Elliott & J. Sargatal, eds. (1996). Handbook of the Birds of the World. Volume 3, Hoatzin to Auks. Barcelona: Lynx Edicions.

Dement'ev, G.P. & N.A. Gladkov (Eds) (1951). Birds of the Soviet Union, Volume 3. Jerusalem: Israel Program for Scientific Translations.

Denning, J. (2005). Roost management in south-East Queensland: building partnerships to replace lost habitat. In: Straw, P., ed. Status and Conservation of Shorebirds in the East Asian-Australasian Flyway. Proceedings of the Australasian Shorebirds Conference 13-15 December 2003. Page(s) 94-96. Sydney, NSW. Wetlands International Global Series 18, International Wader Studies 17.

Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts (DEWHA) (2007e). Migratory Waterbirds Information Page, Departmental Website. Available from: <http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/migratory/waterbirds/index.html#conservation>.

Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts (DEWHA) (2009aj). Draft Significant impact guidelines for 36 migratory shorebirds Draft EPBC Act Policy Statement 3.21. Canberra, ACT: Commonwealth of Australia. Available from: <http://www.environment.gov.au/epbc/publications/migratory-shorebirds.html>.

Garnett, S.T. & G.M. Crowley (2000). The Action Plan for Australian Birds 2000. Canberra, ACT: Environment Australia and Birds Australia. Available from: <http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/publications/action/birds2000/index.html>.

Ge, Z.-M., T.-H. Wang, X. Zhou, K.-Y. Wang & W.-Y. Shi (2007). Changes in the spatial distribution of migratory shorebirds along the Shanghai shoreline, China, between 1984 and 2004. *Emu*. 107:19-27.

Harding, S.B., J.R. Wilson & D.W. Geering (2007). Threats to shorebirds and conservation actions. In: Geering, A., L. Agnew & S. Harding, eds. Shorebirds of Australia. Page(s) 197-213. Melbourne, Victoria: CSIRO Publishing.

Hicks, R.K. (1990). Arrival and departure dates in the Port Moresby area of migrants from the north. *Muruk*. 4:91-105.

Higgins, P.J. & S.J.J.F. Davies, eds (1996). Handbook of Australian, New Zealand and Antarctic Birds. Volume Three - Snipe to Pigeons. Melbourne, Victoria: Oxford University Press.

Hindwood, K.A. & A.R. McGill (1953). The Wood-sandpiper in Australia. *Emu*. 53:1--13.

Lane, B.A. (1987). Shorebirds in Australia. Sydney, NSW: Reed.

Melville, D.S. (1997). Threats to waders along the East Asian-Australasian Flyway. In: Straw, P., ed. Shorebird conservation in the Asia-Pacific region. Page(s) 15-34. Melbourne, Victoria: Birds Australia.

Ming, M., L. Jianjian, T. Chengjia, S. Pingyue & H. Wei (1998). The contribution of shorebirds to the catches of hunters in the Shanghai area, China, during 1997-1998. *Stilt*. 33:32-36.

Morris, A.K. (1975b). The birds of Gosford, Wyong and Newcastle (County of Northumberland). *Australian Birds*. 9:37-76.

Partnership for the East Asian-Australasian Flyway (Partnership EAAF) (2008). East Asian-Australasian Flyway Site Network: October 2008. Available from: <http://www.eaaflyway.net/documents/Flyway-Network-Sites-Oct-08.pdf>.

Round, P.D. (2006). Shorebirds in the Inner Gulf of Thailand. *Stilt*. 50:96-102.

Straw, P. (1992a). Relocation of

Shorebirds. A Feasibility Study and Management Options. Sydney, NSW: Unpublished report by the Royal Australasian Ornithologists Union for the Federal Airports Corporation.\r\n \r\n Straw, P. (1999). Habitat remediation - a last resort?. Stilt. 35:66.\r\n \r\n Thomas, D.J. (1970b). Wader migration across Australia. Emu. 70:145-54.\r\n \r\n Watkins, D. (1993). A national plan for shorebird conservation in Australia. RAOU Report Series. 90.\r\n \r\n Wei, D.L.Z., Y.C. Aik, L.K. Chye, K. Kumar, L.A. Tiah, Y. Chong & C.W. Mun (2006). Shorebird survey of the Malaysian coast November 2004-April 2005. Stilt. 49:7-18.\r\n \r\n White, C.M.N. & M.D. Bruce (1986). The birds of Wallacea. B.O.U. Check-list. 7.\r\n \r\n Wilson, J.R. (2001a). The January and February 2001 Victoria wader count. Stilt. 40:55-64.\r\n \r\n \r\n\r\n"