

When the and the the



Attente



Demography of the Black-backed Woodpecker in unburned boreal forest stands in eastern Canada

it manual a taking aller to be

Junior A. Tremblay, Jacques Ibarzabal and Jean-Pierre L. Savard Colloque annuel du Centre d'étude de la forêt (CEF) Rimouski (Qc), 30 avril 2015





Avian Conservation and Ecology – In review

Black-backed Woodpecker (Picoides arcticus)



Context

- Black-backed Woodpeckers are found at high densities in recently burned forests (Blackford 1955, Hutto 1995, Saab and Powell 2005, Nappi and Drapeau 2009, Nappi et al. 2010)
- The species breeds in unburned forests (Goggans et al. 1989, Tremblay et al. 2009, Craig 2014)
- Hutto (1995) hypothesized that Black-backed Woodpecker populations were maintained by a source/sink dynamic.
- Because recently burned coniferous forests are considered as high-quality habitat for Black-backed Woodpeckers, they should be occupied mainly by experienced, older individuals
- However, Huot and Ibarzabal (2006) suggested that at least part of the colonizing individuals arrived in the same year as the fire, and included mostly second-year birds.





General objectives

 Compare the breeding success of Black-backed Woodpeckers in both unburned and burned forests

 Compare the age composition of breeding Blackbacked Woodpeckers in both unburned and burned forests

3. Evaluate the role of unburned forests in the general population demographics of this species





Study area



Methods – Finding nests



Environnement Canada

Methods – Telemetry









Environnement Environment Canada Canada Page 7 – 5 mai 2015

Methods – Ageing



Molt pattern following Pyle (1997)



FIGURE 121. Beplacement patterns among the secondaries of woodpeckers as an aid to ageing; see text and Figure 25. A single retained juvenal secondary (as shown in illustration **D**) can be found in occasional ASY/ATYs, and may indicate TY/4Y, but more study is needed. Many ASY/ATYs have a pattern similar to that in illustration **D** but without the juvenal feather. Figure from Pyle & Howell (1995)





Methods – Nest monitoring



Methods – Statistical analysis

- Competing models for the daily survival rate (DSR) of nests were evaluated using generalized nonlinear mixed models (Dinsmore et al. 2002, Rotella et al. 2004)
- Given the relatively small sample size, the set of models was limited to 6
- The set of candidate models was evaluated using the Akaike's Information Criterion corrected for small sample size (AICc) (Burnham and Anderson 2002)

| Category | Variable name | Variable description | | | |
|----------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Abiotic | Min. Temp (°C) Max. Temp (°C) | Averaged min. daily temperature over the interval between nest visits Averaged max. daily temperature over the interval between nest visits | | | |
| Biotic | Habitat Parent age | Burned or unburned forest Age of the older parent (SY, TY or ATY) | | | |
| Temporal | Date Year | Julian date 2004, 2005 or 2006 | | | |
| | | | | | |





Results – Daily survival rate (DSR)

<u>Nest</u>

n_{burned}: 21 n_{unburned}: 16

| Models | k | AICc | ΔΑΙϹϲ | ω _i |
|----------------------------|---|--------|-------|----------------|
| Habitat + parent age | 3 | 59.742 | 0.000 | 0.486 |
| Habitat | 2 | 61.932 | 2.190 | 0.163 |
| Habitat + date | 3 | 62.563 | 2.822 | 0.119 |
| Habitat + max. temperature | 3 | 62.856 | 3.114 | 0.102 |
| habitat + min. temperature | 3 | 63.591 | 3.849 | 0.071 |
| Habitat + year | 3 | 63.937 | 4.195 | 0.060 |





Results – DSR by Habitat type & Parent age

| Factor | Daily survival rate | Nesting survival rate | Youngs per successful nest | Productivity |
|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Habitat type | | | | |
| Burned | 0.990 ± 0.007 [21] | 0.79 ± 0.13 [21] | 3.0; 3.0; 3.0 [9] | 2.3 ± 0.3 |
| Unburned | 0.985 ± 0.008 [16] | 0.69 ± 0.13 [16] | 1.5; 2.0; 3.0 [11] | 1.5 ± 0.4 |
| Parent age | | | | |
| Second Year (SY) | 0.978 ± 0.029 [7] | 0.42 ± 0.27 [7] | 2.0; 3.0; 3.0 [5] | 1.0 ± 0.8 |
| Third Year (TY) | 0.984 ± 0.020 [4] | 0.52 ± 0.18 [4] | 2.5; 3.0; 3.0 [3] | 1.4 ± 0.5 |
| After Third Year(ATY) | 0.988 ± 0.015 [15] | 0.61 ± 0.12 [15] | 2.0; 2.5; 3.0 [10] | 1.5 ± 0.4 |

- The DSR of nests were similar in unburned and burned stands
- The number of fledglings per successful nest was greater in burned than unburned forest stands ($\chi^2 = 4.18$, df = 2, P = 0.04)
- But did not differ among parent age ($\chi^2 = 0.21$, df = 2, P = 0.90).





Results – Age-class structure



 The age-class structure of the woodpecker population differed between unburned and burned stands (x² = 9.96, df = 2, P = 0.006, n = 40)





Results – Breeder index

Environnement

Canada

Environment

Canada



- An index < 0 suggests that fewer individuals than expected breed
- An index > 0 suggests that more individuals than expected breed



Results – Demographic contribution

| Stand type | % in the | Area | Nb of | Droductivity | Total |
|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Stand type | landscape ^b | (ha) ^c | nests ^d | Productivity | ouput ^f |
| Burned ^g | | | | | |
| 1-yr burn | 0.4 | 1000 | 110 | 2.6 | 286 |
| 2-yr burn | 0.4 | 1000 | 70 | 2.2 | 154 |
| 3-yr burn | 0.4 | 1000 | 20 | 0.8 | 16 |
| 4-yr burn | 0.4 | 1000 | 20 | 0.8 | 16 |
| 5-yr burn | 0.4 | 1000 | 20 | 0.8 | 16 |
| 6-yr burn | 0.4 | 1000 | 20 | 0.8 | 16 |
| 7-yr burn | 0.4 | 1000 | 20 | 0.8 | 16 |
| 8-yr burn | 0.4 | 1000 | ² D. | rnod | 16 |
| 9-yr burn | 0.4 | 1000 | 2 Durneu | | 16 |
| 10-yr burn | 0.4 | 1000 | <u>2</u> 568 fledglings | | 16 |
| Total | | | | 00 | 568 |
| Unburned | 65 | 162 500 | 10 | | 1625 |
| <i>(</i> >100yr) | 05 | 102 300 | <u> </u> | | 1023 |

^a Based on historical stand age class from Boucher et al. (2011). Almost all regeneration

1625 fledglings

: fire-produced

^b The proportion of regeneration stands was divided equally between each years

 $^{\rm c}$ Based on a 2500 $\rm km^2$ landscape

^d Nest density of 11 nests/100ha for 1-yr burn, 7 nests/100ha for 2-yr burn and 2 nests/100 ha for 3 to 10-year burns (Nappi and Drapeau 2009) and of 0.67 nests/100ha in unburned forest stands (Tremblay et al. 2009)

^e Productivity = Nest success * number of young per successful nest. Data in burned forest stands are from (Nappi and Drapeau 2009; one-year burn: 0.84 *3.1; two-year burn: 0.73 *3.0 and 3 to 10-year burns: 0.25 *3.0), and data for unburned forests are from the present study. We kept constant the values for 3 to 10-year burns and we consider this simulation conservative because most of the burned habitats are only suitable for Black-backed Woodpeckers for the first five after years (Saab and Powell 2005).

^f Total ouput = Nb of nests * Productivity

⁹ Burned forests were assumed to provide breeding habitat for Black-backed Woodpecker from 1 to 10 years after fire and so for unburned forests > 100yr.

Discussion – Wildfires in Québec (2008-2013)



Conclusion

- Burned forests are ephemeral resources and our results show that some Black-backed Woodpeckers still select unburned forests over burned ones, and older individuals tend to breed in greater that expected numbers in unburned habitats
- The results of the present study suggest that if a given habitat, whether unburned or burned, presents sufficient foraging opportunities for nesting, it will generally be selected, even if foraging opportunities are theoretically better in burned areas (cost/benefice tradeoffs).
- Black-backed Woodpecker demography should not be considered as a source-sink scenario as the number of individuals originating from burned forest stands is not as large as previously thought and insufficient for the long-term persistence of the breeding population.
- The Black-backed Woodpecker should be rather seen as an oportunistic species within the context of a pulse-resource dynamic.







Thanks to our field crew !



