

**THE 2005 REPORT OF THE
MONITORING AVIAN PRODUCTIVITY AND SURVIVORSHIP
(MAPS) PROGRAM ON TEXAS ARMY NATIONAL GUARD
INSTALLATIONS CAMP SWIFT AND CAMP BOWIE**

Peter Pyle, Danielle Kaschube, Phil Nott, and David F. DeSante

**THE INSTITUTE FOR BIRD POPULATIONS
P.O. Box 1346
Point Reyes Station, CA 94956-1346**

(415) 663-1436

pnott@birdpop.org

January 4, 2006

Introduction

Since 1989, The Institute for Bird Populations has been coordinating the Monitoring Avian Productivity and Survivorship (MAPS) Program, a cooperative effort among public and private agencies and individual bird banders in North America, to operate a continent-wide network of over 500 constant-effort mist-netting and banding stations. MAPS was designed to provide information on the vital rates (productivity or birth rate, and survivorship or death rate) of landbirds that is critically needed for efforts to identify demographic causes of the severe and sometimes accelerating population declines documented (Robbins et al. 1989, Terborgh 1989, Peterjohn et al. 1995) for many species of North American landbirds (DeSante 1992, DeSante et al. 1995, 1999, 2001a). Such data on vital rates are also critically needed in efforts to identify management strategies to reverse such population declines (DeSante 1995, DeSante and Rosenberg 1998).

MAPS is organized to fulfill three sets of goals and objectives: monitoring, research, and management. The specific **monitoring** goals of MAPS are to provide, for over 100 target species, including Neotropical-wintering migrants, temperate-wintering migrants, and permanent residents: (a) annual indices of adult population size and post-fledging productivity from data on the numbers and proportions of young and adult birds captured; and (b) annual estimates of adult population size, adult survival rates, proportions of residents, and recruitment into the adult population from modified Cormack- Jolly-Seber analyses of mark-recapture data on adult birds.

The specific **research** goals of MAPS are to identify and describe: (a) temporal and spatial patterns in these demographic indices and estimates at a variety of spatial scales ranging from the local landscape to the entire continent; and (b) relationships between these patterns and ecological characteristics of the target species, population trends of the target species, station-specific and landscape-level habitat characteristics, and spatially-explicit weather variables.

The specific **management** goals of MAPS are to use these patterns and relationships, at the appropriate spatial scales, to: (a) identify thresholds and trigger points to notify appropriate agencies and organizations of the need for further research and/or management actions; (b) determine the proximate demographic cause(s) of population change; (c) suggest management actions and conservation strategies to reverse population declines and maintain stable or increasing populations; and (d) evaluate the effectiveness of the management actions and conservation strategies actually implemented through an adaptive management framework.

All of these monitoring, research, and management goals are in agreement with the Department of Defense (DoD) Partners-in-Flight strategy. Moreover, because birds are excellent indicators of the health of ecological systems, they can serve as a sensitive barometer of the overall effectiveness of efforts to maintain the biodiversity and ecological integrity of military installations. Accordingly, the MAPS program was initiated on select military installations beginning in 1992 and soon became one of the focus projects of the DoD Partners-in-Flight program. It was expected that information from the MAPS program would be capable of aiding research and management efforts on these military installations to protect and enhance the installations' avifauna and ecological integrity, while allowing them to fulfill their military mission.

Accordingly, in 1994, 12 MAPS stations were established and operated on Texas National Guard Installations Camp Swift (6 stations) and Camp Bowie (6 stations). The operation of these stations was continued during the summers of 1994-2002 by means of funding from the DoD Legacy Resource Management Program. The operation of the 12 stations was continued during the summers of 2003-2005 by means of funding from the Texas Army National Guard.

The ultimate objective of the MAPS Program on military installations, such as Camp Swift and Camp Bowie, is to identify generalized management guidelines and formulate specific management actions that can be implemented on military installations and elsewhere to reverse the population declines of target landbird species and maintain populations of stable or increasing species. The identification and formulation of these management guidelines and actions is to be achieved by modeling the vital rates (productivity and survivorship) of the various landbird species as a function of landscape-level habitat characteristics and spatially explicit weather variables. Our goal is to identify relationships between productivity (and survivorship for permanent resident species) and these habitat and weather variables. The management strategies will involve efforts to modify habitat characteristics from those associated with low productivity to those associated with high productivity, for species in which low productivity is driving a population decline.

The Legacy Resource Management Program allowed us to undertake these analyses and formulate management strategies. These analyses have now been completed (Nott et al. 2003) and management guidelines have been formulated for ten bird species of conservation concern that breed in the southeastern United States. With additional funding from the Legacy Resource Management Program, we are currently implementing these guidelines and actions on eight military installations (including Camp Swift and Camp Bowie) in conjunction with efforts to increase military Readiness and Range Sustainment (Nott and Michel 2005). The strategy for implementing these guidelines includes the establishment of new MAPS stations to monitor their effectiveness, the discontinuance of an equal number of old stations, and the continued operation of others of the old stations to serve as controls for the new management stations. In this way, the total number of stations operated has remained the same.

At Camp Swift in 2004, we replaced the McLaughlin Creek station with a new station, Dropzone, aimed at better monitoring Painted Buntings, a declining species at Camp Swift. We achieved this by looking for habitat patterns that, according to our models, should support healthy bunting populations (e.g., oak prairie). We also hypothesized that, by implementing warm season burns, we would be able to enhance the restoration of native grasses and forbs in the oak prairie habitat, and that this should further increase population sizes and reproductive success of Painted Buntings. Unfortunately, such controlled burns as part of a warm-season fire regime could not be implemented during 2004 due to unfavorable weather conditions, but further attempts to affect this regime are planned for the spring of 2005. We plan to establish a new station in an area of such controlled burns to help us to monitor the effects of these management actions.

At Camp Bowie no stations were replaced, all six having been in operation since 1994. there are currently management plans to restore riparian corridors, fill stock ponds, prescribe fires to clear vegetation for military training purposes and restore native plant communities, and possibly to reduce or cease cattle grazing to create more grassland habitat and reduce the success of Brown-headed Cowbirds. There are no current plans to move existing MAPS stations, merely to monitor the changes in avifauna that will occur when the proposed management actions are implemented.

A complete summary of the results of the MAPS Program on Camp Swift and Camp Bowie from 1994-1999, as well as on 11 other installations or groups of nearby installations in eastern United States, was presented by DeSante et al. (2001b). This report briefly updates both that earlier report and previous year's reports (DeSante et al. 2004, 2005a), and documents the operation of the 12 MAPS stations on Camp Swift and Camp Bowie during the 2005 breeding season.

Methods

Six MAPS stations were operated in 2005 on each of Camp Swift and Camp Bowie. At Camp Swift, five stations were at the same locations where they were first established in 1994. The sixth station, Dropzone, was established in 2004 in an area of mixed little bluestem grassland and post oak woodland habitat bordered by cedars and loblolly pines, on the border of a Texas Reserve Air National Guard drop zone. While the location of this site was initially selected from species/landscape models of MAPS data, point counts were conducted in the area to verify the abundance of Painted Buntings prior to final site selection for this new station. At Camp Bowie the same six stations have been operated from 1994 through 2005.

All MAPS stations were operated in accordance with the highly standardized banding protocols established by The Institute for Bird Populations for use by the MAPS Program throughout North America and spelled out in detail in the MAPS Manual (DeSante et al. 2005b). On each day of operation each year, one 12-m long, 30-mm mesh, 4-tier nylon mist net was erected at each of ten fixed mist-net sites within the interior eight ha of each 20-ha station. These ten nets at each station were operated for six morning hours per day (beginning at local sunrise) for one day in each of nine consecutive 10-day periods between May 11 and August 4 (Tables 1 and 6). The operation of all stations occurred on schedule in each ten-day period. The operation of stations at Swift was carried out by field biologist interns Randall Scheiner and Evan Wilson and the operation of stations at Bowie were carried out by Laurel McDonald and Julia Fronfeld. All four of these interns were trained by IBP field biologists Eric Miller and Amy Finfera and were supervised by Eric Miller throughout the season.

With few exceptions, all birds captured during the course of the study were identified to species, age, and sex and, if unbanded, were banded with USGS/BRD numbered aluminum bands. Birds were released immediately upon capture and before being banded or processed if situations arose where bird safety would be compromised. The following data were taken on all birds captured, including recaptures, according to MAPS guidelines using standardized codes and forms (DeSante et al. 2005):

- (1) capture code (newly banded, recaptured, band changed, unbanded);

- (2) band number;
- (3) species;
- (4) age and how aged;
- (5) sex (if possible) and how sexed (if applicable);
- (6) extent of skull pneumaticization;
- (7) breeding condition of adults (i.e., extent of cloacal protuberance or brood patch);
- (8) extent of juvenal plumage in young birds;
- (9) extent of body and flight-feather molt;
- (10) extent of primary-feather wear;
- (11) presence of molt limits and plumage characteristics;
- (12) wing chord;
- (13) fat class and body mass;
- (14) date and time of capture (net-run time);
- (15) station and net site where captured; and
- (16) any pertinent notes.

Effort data (i.e., the number and timing of net-hours on each day of operation) were also collected in a standardized manner. In order to allow constant-effort comparisons of data to be made, the times of opening and closing the array of mist nets and of beginning each net check were recorded to the nearest ten minutes. The breeding (summer residency) status (confirmed breeder, likely breeder, non-breeder) of each species seen, heard, or captured at each MAPS station on each day of operation was recorded using techniques similar to those employed for breeding bird atlas projects.

The computer entry, proofing, and verification of all banding, effort, and breeding status data were completed by IBP biologists using specially designed data entry, verification, and editing programs. The critical data for each banding record (capture code, band number, species, age, sex, date, capture time, station, and net number) were proofed by hand against the raw data and any computer-entry errors were corrected. All banding data were then run through a series of verification programs as follows:

- (1) Clean-up programs to check the validity of all codes entered and the ranges of all numerical data;
- (2) Cross-check programs to compare station, date, and net fields from the banding data with those from the effort and breeding status data;
- (3) Cross-check programs to compare species, age, and sex determinations against degree of skull pneumaticization, breeding condition (extent of cloacal protuberance and brood patch), extent of juvenal plumage, extent of body and flight-feather molt, extent of primary-feather wear, and presence of molt limits and plumage characteristics;
- (4) Screening programs which allow identification of unusual or duplicate band numbers or unusual band sizes for each species; and
- (5) Verification programs to screen banding and recapture data from all years of operation for inconsistent species, age, or sex determinations for each band number.

Any discrepancies or suspicious data identified by any of these programs were examined manually and corrected if necessary. Wing chord, body mass, fat content, date and station of capture, and any pertinent notes were used as supplementary information for the correct determination of species, age, and sex in all of these verification processes. The proofed, verified, and corrected banding data from each year were then run through a series of analysis programs that calculated for each species and for all species pooled at each station and for all stations pooled on each forest:

- (1) the numbers of newly banded birds, recaptured birds, and birds released unbanded;
- (2) the numbers and capture rates (per 600 net-hours) of first captures (in each year) for individual adult and young birds; and
- (3) the proportion of young in the catch.

Following the procedures pioneered by the British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) in their CES Scheme (Peach et al. 1996), the number of adult birds captured was used as an index of adult population size. For our estimate of post-fledging productivity, we are now using “reproductive index” (number of young divided by number of adults) as opposed to “proportion of young in the catch” previously used. Reproductive index is a more intuitive value for productivity, and it is also more comparable to other calculated MAPS parameters such as recruitment indices.

Survival of target species was estimated using Modified Cormack-Jolly-Seber (CJS) mark-recapture analyses (Pollock et al. 1990, Lebreton et al. 1992) on 12 years (1994-2005) of capture histories of adult birds from the six stations at each location. Target species were those for which, on average, at least 2.5 individual adults per year and at least two between-year returns were recorded from the six stations pooled per location, at which the species was a breeder during more than half of the years the station was operated. Using the computer program TMSURVIV (White 1983, Hines et al. 2003), we calculated, for each target species, maximum-likelihood estimates and standard errors (*SEs*) for adult survival probability, adult recapture probability, and the proportion of residents among newly captured adults using a time-constant, between- and within-year transient model (Pradel et al. 1997, Nott and DeSante 2002, Hines et al. 2003). The use of the transient model accounts for the existence of transient adults (dispersing and floater individuals which are only captured once) in the sample of newly captured birds, and provides survival estimates that are unbiased with respect to these transient individuals (Pradel et al. 1997). Recapture probability is defined as the conditional probability of recapturing a bird in a subsequent year that was banded in a previous year, given that it survived and returned to the place it was originally banded.

Results and Discussion

CAMP SWIFT

We operated six MAPS stations at Camp Swift during the summer of 2005 for a total of 3249.3 net-hours. The details of the operation of these six stations are presented in Table 1.

For each individual species and for all species pooled, the numbers of individual birds newly banded, captured and released unbanded (including hummingbirds, which we are not licensed to band), and recaptured are presented for each station in Table 2, and for all stations combined in Table 4. A total of 654 captures of 30 species occurred at Camp Swift during the summer of 2005 (Table 4). Newly banded birds comprised 61.2% of the total captures. The greatest number of total captures (131) was recorded at the East Loop East station and the smallest number of total captures (69) was recorded at the Sandy Junction station (Table 2). The highest species richness occurred at Dropzone (18 species) and the lowest species richness occurred at Wine Cellar Loop (11 species).

The capture rates (per 600 net-hours) of individual adult and young birds and the proportion of young in the catch are presented for each species and for all species pooled at each station in Table 3, and for all stations combined in Table 4. We present capture rates (captures per 600 net-hours) of adults and young in these tables so that the data can be compared among stations which, because of the vagaries of weather and accidental net damage, can differ from one another in effort expended (Table 1). Adult population size (for all species pooled) was highest at East Loop East (77.3 adults/600 net hours; Table 3), followed by East Loop West (66.4), Wine Cellar Loop (65.8), Dropzone (63.4), Pipeline (56.2), and Sandy Junction (30.0).

Wine Cellar Loop

Painted Bunting
White-eyed Vireo
Northern Cardinal
Carolina Wren

East Loop West

White-eyed Vireo
Northern Cardinal
Carolina Wren
Carolina Chickadee

Pipeline

Northern Cardinal
Painted Bunting
White-eyed Vireo
Carolina Wren
Blue-gray Gnatcatcher
Summer Tanager

Sandy Junction

Painted Bunting
Northern Cardinal
Tufted Titmouse

East Loop East

Northern Cardinal
Painted Bunting
White-eyed Vireo
Tufted Titmouse
Carolina Wren

Dropzone

Painted Bunting
White-eyed Vireo
Northern Cardinal
Carolina Wren

Among individual species, Northern Cardinal was the most frequently captured at the six stations in 2005, followed by White-eyed Vireo, Painted Bunting, Carolina Wren, Carolina Chickadee, and Tufted Titmouse (Table 4). The most abundant breeding species, having a capture rate of at least 3.0 adults per 600 net-hours, in decreasing order, were Painted Bunting, Northern Cardinal, White-eyed Vireo, and Carolina Wren (Table 4). The most abundant

breeding species at each installation, having capture rates of at least 3.0 adults/600 net-hours were as follows (Table 3 above):

Reproductive index (the number of young per adult captured) showed a different pattern over the six stations than adult population size, being highest at Dropzone (0.70), followed by East Loop West (0.59), East Loop East (0.45), Pipeline (0.42), Wine Cellar Loop (0.40), and Sandy Junction (0.32). The overall Reproductive index for the six stations in 2005 was 0.48 (Table 4), an increase over last year's index of 0.37 at Camp Swift. Mean productivity for all species pooled at Camp Swift during the six years 1994-1999 was 0.294 (see DeSante et al. 2001b), indicating that productivity in both 2004 and 2005 were well above average.

Using 12 years of data (1994-2005) from all six stations combined, estimates of adult survival and recapture probabilities were obtained for six target species breeding at Camp Swift. Maximum-likelihood estimates of annual adult survival probability, recapture probability, and proportion of residents among newly captured adults from the time-constant transient model are presented in Table 5 for these six species. Survival-rate estimates for all six species showed good precision (CVs < 22%) with a mean CV of 12.2% an improvement of 1.1% from the mean CV for the same six species using 11 years of data (13.3%). Annual adult survival rates for these six species ranged from a low of 0.435 for Carolina Wren to a high of 0.610 for Summer Tanager, with a mean of 0.538 for the six species. This compares to a mean survival of 0.531 for the same six species after 11 year's of data had been collected, indicating comparable survival of Camp Swift species during the winters of 2003-2005. Survivorship at Camp Swift also appears to be at least comparable to that of the South-central Region as a whole (DeSante et al. 2004).

As mentioned earlier, analyses aimed at identifying and describing relationships between four demographic parameters (adult population size, population trend, number of young, and productivity) and landscape-level habitat characteristics for ten bird species of conservation concern have been completed for 13 military installations in south-central and southeastern United States, including Camp Swift (Nott et al. 2003, Nott et al. 2005). At Camp Swift, one species, Painted Bunting, emerged as a candidate for particular management concern. Regional experts predict that post-breeding fire management practices, as opposed to the current spring or fall practices, would (given adequate winter precipitation) result in a more natural and diverse cool-season grassland and richer springtime/early summer forb community, which should benefit buntings.

An objective of the MAPS program at Camp Swift is to evaluate the effectiveness of such proposed and on-going management practices, and to modify them, according to an adaptive management process, to reverse declining populations and maintain stable or increasing populations of target landbird species. During 2004 we made advancements toward these goals by replacing a woodland station (McLaughlin Creek), which experienced few captures of Painted Buntings, with the Dropzone station. We predicted from our species/landscape models, that the new station would have higher capture rates and high productivity in general. Moreover, this station underwent habitat management in the form of prescribed burning during the spring of 2005, which we predicted would provide high quality Painted Bunting habitat by improving the nesting and foraging quality of the Camp Swift's oak-prairie habitats and encouraging the

establishment of a more natural grassland-forb community than previously existed.

In 2004 we captured 7.6 adult Painted Buntings per 600 net-hours at Dropzone, and this increased to 20.7 adults per 600 net-hours in 2005 (Table 3). Reproductive Index was 0.49 and 0.27, respectively, indicating reasonable but reduced productivity. This provides evidence that the species/landscape models developed through our analyses of MAPS data have substantial predictive power, and that the prescribed burn appears to have resulted in increased recruitment of this species (which, predictably, would show lower productivity due to a surplus of first-time breeders).

Painted Bunting requires the right mix of forest, shrub and grassland to breed successfully which must be maintained by fire or physical means. The conservation goal is to consistently provide enough primary breeding habitat to annually support a target number of territories (dependent on installation or management zone) level of productivity consistent with that of a "source" population in which breeding individuals replace their own numbers. This requires maintaining a mosaic of habitat patches in various stages of post-fire succession such that every year there is an adequate area of primary breeding habitat. The ability to maintain an abundant "source" population might be considered an adequate performance measure by which to evaluate landbird conservation efforts and habitat management techniques.

CAMP BOWIE

We operated six MAPS stations at Camp Bowie during the summer of 2005 for a total of 2590.8 net-hours. The details of the operation of these six stations are presented in Table 6.

For each individual species and for all species pooled, the numbers of individual birds newly banded, captured and released unbanded (including hummingbirds, which we are not licensed to band), and recaptured are presented for each station in Table 7, and for all stations combined in Table 9. A total of 474 captures of 29 species occurred at Camp Bowie during the summer of 2005 (Table 9). Newly banded birds comprised 58.0% of the total captures. The greatest number of total captures (104) was recorded at the Devil's Hill station and the smallest number of total captures (42) was recorded at the Mockingbird Lane station (Table 7). The highest species richness occurred at Mesquite Flat (20 species) and the lowest species richness occurred at Mockingbird Lane (9 species).

The capture rates (per 600 net-hours) of individual adult and young birds and the proportion of young in the catch are presented for each species and for all species pooled at each station in Table 8, and for all stations combined in Table 9. We present capture rates (captures per 600 net-hours) of adults and young in these tables so that the data can be compared among stations which, because of the vagaries of weather and accidental net damage, can differ from one another in effort expended (Table 6). Adult population size (for all species pooled) was highest at Stonehouse (84.1 adults/600 net hours; Table 8), followed by Mesquite Flat (68.0), Devil's Hill (61.7), Nighthawk (53.3), Bedrock (31.8), and Mockingbird Lane (29.0).

Among individual species, Painted Bunting was the most frequently captured at the six stations in 2005, followed by Bewick's Wren, Northern Cardinal, Black-crested Titmouse, Summer Tanager, and Rufous-crowned Sparrow (Table 9). The most abundant breeding species, having a capture rate of at least 3.0 adults per 600 net-hours, in decreasing order, were Painted Bunting, Northern Cardinal, Bewick's Wren, Summer Tanager, Rufous-crowned Sparrow, and Field Sparrow (Table 9). The most abundant breeding species at each installation, having capture rates of at least 3.0 adults/600 net-hours were as follows (Table 8):

Mesquite Flat

Painted Bunting
Eastern Bluebird
Summer Tanager
Ladder-backed Woodpecker
Bewick's Wren
Golden-fronted Woodpecker

Nighthawk

Northern Cardinal
Field Sparrow
Summer Tanager
Rufous-crowned Sparrow
Bewick's Wren
Painted Bunting
Black-crested Titmouse

Devil's Hill

Painted Bunting
Bewick's Wren
Rufous-crowned Sparrow
Northern Cardinal
Yellow-billed Cuckoo
Black-crested Titmouse
Summer Tanager

Bedrock

Summer Tanager
Painted Bunting
Yellow-billed Cuckoo
Bewick's Wren

Stonehouse

Painted Bunting
Northern Cardinal
Bewick's Wren
Field Sparrow
Black-crested Titmouse
Northern Mockingbird
Summer Tanager
Canyon Towhee

Mockingbird Lane

Painted Bunting
Northern Cardinal
Field Sparrow

Reproductive index (the number of young per adult captured) showed a different pattern over the six stations than adult population size, being highest at Devil's Hill (0.95), followed by Mockingbird Lane (0.60), Bedrock (0.47), Mesquite Flat (0.44), Nighthawk (0.40), and Stonehouse (0.23). The overall Reproductive index for the six stations in 2005 was 0.49 (Table 9), a decrease over last year's index of 0.37 at Camp Bowie. Mean productivity for all species pooled at Camp Bowie during the six years 1994-1999 was 0.43 (see DeSante et al. 2001b), indicating that productivity in 2004 was below average but that of 2005 was above average.

Using 12 years of data (1994-2005) from all six stations combined, estimates of adult survival and recapture probabilities were obtained for 14 target species breeding at Camp Bowie. Maximum-likelihood estimates of annual adult survival probability, recapture probability, and proportion of residents among newly captured adults from the time-constant transient model are presented in Table 10 for these 14 species. Survival-rate estimates for all 14 species showed good to poor precision (CVs 6-49%) with a mean of 21.2%. The mean for 13 of these species (all but Carolina Chickadee), 19.1% showed a slight improvement over the mean CV for these species using 11 years of data (19.6%). Annual adult survival rates for these 14 species ranged from a low of 0.280 for Northern Mockingbird to a high of 0.782 for Great Crested Flycatcher, with a mean of 0.526 for the six species.

As mentioned earlier, analyses aimed at identifying and describing relationships between four demographic parameters (adult population size, population trend, number of young, and productivity) and landscape-level habitat characteristics for ten bird species of conservation concern have been completed for 13 military installations in south-central and southeastern United States, including Camp Bowie (Nott et al. 2003, Nott et al. 2005). At Camp Bowie, previous data has suggested an installation-wide decline in all breeding landbirds, including three species of management concern (Bewick's Wren, Field Sparrow, and Painted Bunting). Post-breeding fire management practices in oldfield and scrub/woodland habitats could reset succession and effect local recoveries of the three species of concern (plus the Endangered Black-capped Vireo), while exclusion of cattle grazing from key areas could also be an effective management strategy for these and other species at Camp Bowie. The restoration of wet-season riparian corridors could be another effective management strategy and will require the removal of stock ponds and re-establishment of natural watercourses at the Camp. We recommend that these management practices be undertaken at Bowie soon, so that we can monitor their effects on landbird populations. Currently there are no plans to move existing MAPS stations, merely to monitor the changes in avifauna that will occur when the proposed management actions are implemented.

Acknowledgements

We thank field biologist interns Randall Scheiner, Evan Wilson, Laurel McDonald, and Julia Fronfeld for collecting the 2005 data. We thank Eric Miller and Amy Finfera for training the interns, and Eric Miller for supervising the running of these stations in 2005. We thank Dawn Johnson for her support of and assistance with all of the logistical and administrative aspects of this work. Financial support for this work was provided by the Texas Army National Guard through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntsville Center. Suzanne Murdoch and Deborah Hendry of the Huntsville Center helped facilitate this funding. This is Contribution Number 274 of The Institute for Bird Populations.

Literature Cited

- DeSante, D.F. (1992) Monitoring Avian Productivity and Survivorship (MAPS): a sharp, rather than blunt, tool for monitoring and assessing landbird populations. *In*: D. R. McCullough and R. H. Barrett (Eds.), Wildlife 2001: Populations, pp. 511-521. (London, U.K.: Elsevier Applied Science).
- DeSante, D.F. (1995) Suggestions for future directions for studies of marked migratory landbirds from the perspective of a practitioner in population management and conservation. Journal Applied Statistics 22, pp. 949-965.
- DeSante, D.F., Burton, K.M., Saracco, J.F., & Walker, B.L. (1995) Productivity indices and survival rate estimates from MAPS, a continent-wide programme of constant-effort mist netting in North America. Journal Applied Statistics, 22, pp. 935-947.
- DeSante, D.F., Burton, K.M., Velez, P., & Froehlich, D. (2005b) MAPS Manual, Point Reyes Station, CA: The Institute for Bird Populations; 49 pp.
- DeSante, D.F., Nott, M.P., & O'Grady, D.R. (2001a) Identifying the proximate demographic cause(s) of population change by modeling spatial variation in productivity, survivorship, and population trends. Ardea, 89(special issue), pp.185-207.

- DeSante, D.F., O'Grady, D.R. & Pyle, P. (1999) Measures of productivity and survival derived from standardized mist netting are consistent with observed population changes. Bird Study 46 (suppl.):S178-188.
- DeSante, D.F., Pyle, P., & Kaschube, D. (2004) The 2003 report of the Monitoring Avian Productivity and Survivorship (MAPS) Program on Texas Army National Guard Installations Camp Bowie and Camp Swift. Point Reyes Station, CA: The Institute for Bird Populations; 8 pp.
- DeSante, D.F., Pyle, P., & Kaschube, D. (2005a) The 2004 report of the Monitoring Avian Productivity and Survivorship (MAPS) Program on Texas Army National Guard Installation Camp Swift. Point Reyes Station, CA: The Institute for Bird Populations; 9 pp.
- DeSante, D.F., Pyle, P., & O'Grady, D.R. (2001b) The 1992-1999 report of the Monitoring Avian Productivity and Survivorship (MAPS Program on military installations in eastern United States. The Institute for Bird Populations, Point Reyes Station, CA 113 pp.
- DeSante, D.F., & Rosenberg, D.K. (1998) What do we need to monitor in order to manage landbirds? *In*: J. Marzluff & R. Sallabanks (Eds.), Avian Conservation: Research Needs and Effective Implementation, pp. 93-106. Island Press, Washington, DC.
- Hines, J.E., Kendall, W.L., & Nichols, J.D. (2003) On the use of the robust design with transient capture-recapture models. Auk, 120, pp.1151-1158
- Lebreton, J.-D., Burnham, K.P., Clobert, J., & Anderson, D.R. (1992) Modeling survival and testing biological hypotheses using marked animals: a unified approach with case studies, Ecological Monographs, 62, pp. 67-118.
- Nott, M.P., & DeSante, D.F. (2002) Demographic monitoring and the identification of transients in mark-recapture models. Pp. 727-736 *in*: J.M. Scott & P. Heglund (eds.), Predicting Species Occurrences: Issues of Scale and Accuracy. Island Press, NY.
- Nott, M.P., & Michel, N. (2005) Management strategies for reversing declines in landbirds of conservation concern on military installations: Predictive modelling of landbird populations on military installations. The Institute for Bird Populations, Pt. Reyes Station, CA.
- Nott, M.P., DeSante, D.F., & Michel, N. (2003) Management strategies for reversing declines in landbirds of conservation concern on military installations: A landscape-scale analysis of MAPS data. The Institute for Bird Populations, Pt. Reyes Station, CA.
- Peach, W.J., Buckland, S.T., & Baillie, S.R. (1996) The use of constant effort mist-netting to measure between-year changes in the abundance and productivity of common passerines. Bird Study, 43, pp. 142-156.
- Peterjohn, B.G., Sauer, J.R., & Robbins, C.S. (1995) Population trends from the North American Breeding Bird Survey. *In*: T.E. Martin and D.M. Finch, Ecology and Management of Neotropical Migratory Birds, New York: Oxford University Press; pp. 3-39.
- Pollock, K.H., Nichols, J.D., Brownie, C., & Hines, J.E. (1990) Statistical inference for capture-recapture experiments, Wildlife Monographs, No. 107.
- Pradel, R., Hines, J., Lebreton, J.-D., & Nichols, J.D. (1997) Estimating survival probabilities and proportions of 'transients' using capture-recapture data. Biometrics, 53, pp. 60-72.
- Robbins, C.S., Sauer, J.R., Greenberg, R.S., & Droege, S. (1989) Population declines in North American birds that migrate to the Neotropics, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (USA), 86, pp. 7658-7662.
- Terborgh, J. (1989) Where Have All the Birds Gone?, Essays on the Biology and Conservation of Birds that Migrate to the American Tropics, Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press; 207 pp.

White, G.C. (1983) Numerical estimation of survival rates from band-recovery and biotelemetry data. J. Wildlife Management, 47, pp. 716-728.

Table 1. Summary of the 2005 MAPS program on Camp Swift.

Station					Avg Elev. (m)	2005 operation		
Name	Code	No.	Major Habitat Type	Latitude-longitude		Total number of net-hours ¹	No. of periods	Inclusive dates
Wine Cellar Loop	WCLO	14439	Post oak/cedar woodland, open field	30°16'27"N,97°19'13"W	137	547.5 (540.8)	9	5/11 - 7/31
Pipeline	PIPE	14436	Post oak/cedar woodland, successional oak/cedar oldfield	30°17'00"N,97°19'42"W	143	609.0 (539.8)	9	5/12 - 8/02
East Loop East	EALE	14438	Successional oldfield, oak/cedar woodland	30°15'55"N,97°15'48"W	152	504.8 (492.7)	9	5/14 - 7/30
East Loop West	EALW	14437	Open oak/cedar woodland, dense oak/cedar woodland, early-successional oldfield	30°15'45"N,97°16'19"W	152	533.0 (512.2)	9	5/13 - 8/01
Dropzone	DROP	14509	mixed grassland/post oak woodland	30°15'12"N,97°16'24"W	152	435.5 (408.5)	9	5/16 - 8/04
Sandy Junction	SAJU	14440	Post oak/cedar woodland	30°17'09"N,97°17'23"W	155	619.5 (596.7)	9	5/17 - 8/03
ALL STATIONS COMBINED						3249.3(3090.7)	9	5/11 - 8/04

¹ Total net-hours in 2005. Net-hours in 2005 that could be compared in a constant-effort manner to 2004 are shown in parentheses.

Table 2. Capture summary for the six individual MAPS stations operated on Camp Swift in 2005.
 N = Newly Banded, U = Unbanded, R = Recaptures of banded birds.

Species	Wine Cellar Loop			Pipeline			East Loop East			East Loop West			Dropzone			Sandy Junction		
	N	U	R	N	U	R	N	U	R	N	U	R	N	U	R	N	U	R
Mourning Dove		1																1
Inca Dove														1				
Common Ground-Dove														2				
Yellow-billed Cuckoo													1					
Ruby-throated Hummingbird														1				2
Unidentified Hummingbird								1										
Red-bellied Woodpecker							2	1										1
Pileated Woodpecker		2																
Traill's Flycatcher	1						3			1			3					3
Great Crested Flycatcher							1											
Unidentified Flycatcher								3			3							
White-eyed Vireo	11		15	8	1	8	17	1	9	29		15	21		6	1		
Red-eyed Vireo							2									1		
Carolina Chickadee	1		1	3			4	2	1	5		1	5			4	2	
Tufted Titmouse	1			2		1	5		1	1			3			8		1
Carolina Wren	14	1	6	9	1	8	7		5	9	3	6	6		6	4	1	1
Blue-gray Gnatcatcher				4						2	4			1			1	
Swainson's Thrush	3			1									1			1		
Gray Catbird							1											
Northern Parula													1					
Magnolia Warbler										1								
Pine Warbler				3												1		
Black-and-white Warbler													1			1		
Mourning Warbler							1											
MacGillivray's Warbler													1					
Common Yellowthroat							1			2			1					

Table 2. (cont.) Capture summary for the six individual MAPS stations operated on Camp Swift in 2005.
 N = Newly Banded, U = Unbanded, R = Recaptures of banded birds.

Species	Wine Cellar Loop			Pipeline			East Loop East			East Loop West			Dropzone			Sandy Junction		
	N	U	R	N	U	R	N	U	R	N	U	R	N	U	R	N	U	R
Wilson's Warbler					1													
Unidentified Warbler								1										
Summer Tanager	1			4		1							1			2		1
Northern Cardinal	12	2	8	18	6	15	17		15	21		12	12	1	3	8	3	2
Indigo Bunting							2		1	5	1	2						
Painted Bunting	22	1	11	10		7	17		10	1			17	2	5	6	4	9
Brown-headed Cowbird				1								2						
ALL SPECIES POOLED	66	7	41	63	9	40	80	9	42	77	11	38	73	9	20	41	14	14
Total Number of Captures		114			112			131			126			102			69	
Number of Species	9	5	5	11	4	6	14	6	7	11	4	6	13	7	4	13	7	5
Total Number of Species		11			12			17			13			18			16	

Table 3. Numbers of adult and young individual birds captured per 600 net-hours and reproductive index (young/adult) at the six individual MAPS stations operated on Camp Swift in 2005.

Species	Wine Cellar Loop			Pipeline			East Loop East			East Loop West			Dropzone			Sandy Junction		
	Ad.	Yg.	Repr. index	Ad.	Yg.	Repr. index	Ad.	Yg.	Repr. index	Ad.	Yg.	Repr. index	Ad.	Yg.	Repr. index	Ad.	Yg.	Repr. index
Yellow-billed Cuckoo													1.4	0.0	0.00			
Red-bellied Woodpecker							0.0	2.4	und. ¹							1.0	0.0	0.00
Great Crested Flycatcher							1.2	0.0	0.00									
White-eyed Vireo	16.4	3.3	0.20	9.9	1.0	0.10	14.3	9.5	0.67	29.3	10.1	0.35	17.9	15.2	0.85	1.0	0.0	0.00
Red-eyed Vireo							2.4	0.0	0.00							1.0	0.0	0.00
Carolina Chickadee	2.2	0.0	0.00	0.0	3.0	und. ¹	1.2	3.6	3.00	3.4	2.3	0.67	1.4	5.5	4.00	1.0	2.9	3.00
Tufted Titmouse	0.0	1.1	und. ¹	1.0	2.0	2.00	3.6	3.6	1.00	0.0	1.1	und. ¹	0.0	4.1	und. ¹	3.9	2.9	0.75
Carolina Wren	3.3	13.2	4.00	7.9	6.9	0.88	3.6	5.9	1.67	5.6	7.9	1.40	5.5	5.5	1.00	1.9	1.9	1.00
Blue-gray Gnatcatcher				3.9	0.0	0.00				1.1	1.1	1.00						
Northern Parula													0.0	1.4	und.			
Pine Warbler				0.0	3.0	und.										0.0	1.0	und. ¹
Black-and-white Warbler																1.0	0.0	0.00
Common Yellowthroat							1.2	0.0	0.00	2.3	0.0	0.00	1.4	0.0	0.00			
Summer Tanager	1.1	0.0	0.00	3.0	1.0	0.33							1.4	0.0	0.00	2.9	0.0	0.00
Northern Cardinal	13.2	4.4	0.33	15.8	6.9	0.44	23.8	5.9	0.25	20.3	13.5	0.67	13.8	6.9	0.50	7.7	1.0	0.13
Indigo Bunting							2.4	0.0	0.00	2.3	3.4	1.50						
Painted Bunting	29.6	4.4	0.15	13.8	0.0	0.00	23.8	3.6	0.15	1.1	0.0	0.00	20.7	5.5	0.27	8.7	0.0	0.00
Brown-headed Cowbird				1.0	0.0	0.00				1.1	0.0	0.00						
ALL SPECIES POOLED	65.8	26.3	0.40	56.2	23.6	0.42	77.3	34.5	0.45	66.4	39.4	0.59	63.4	44.1	0.70	30.0	9.7	0.32
Number of Species	6	5		8	7		10	7		9	7		8	7		10	5	
Total Number of Species		7			10			11			10			10			11	

¹ Reproductive index (young/adult) is undefined because no adults of this species were captured at this station in this year.

Table 4. Summary of results for all six Camp Swift MAPS stations combined in 2005.

Species	Birds captured			Birds/600 nethours		Reprod. Index
	Newly banded	Un-banded	Recap-tured	Adults	Young	
Mourning Dove		2				
Inca Dove		1				
Common Ground-Dove		2				
Yellow-billed Cuckoo	1			0.2	0.0	0.00
Ruby-throated Hummingbird		3				
Unidentified Hummingbird		1				
Red-bellied Woodpecker	3	1		0.2	0.4	2.00
Pileated Woodpecker		2				
Traill's Flycatcher	11					
Great Crested Flycatcher	1			0.2	0.0	0.00
Unidentified Flycatcher		6				
White-eyed Vireo	87	2	53	14.0	5.7	0.41
Red-eyed Vireo	3			0.6	0.0	0.00
Carolina Chickadee	22	4	3	1.5	2.8	1.88
Tufted Titmouse	20		3	1.5	2.4	1.63
Carolina Wren	49	6	32	4.6	6.6	1.44
Blue-gray Gnatcatcher	6	6		0.9	0.2	0.20
Swainson's Thrush	6					
Gray Catbird	1					
Northern Parula	1			0.0	0.2	und. ¹
Magnolia Warbler	1					
Pine Warbler	4			0.0	0.7	und.
Black-and-white Warbler	1	1		0.2	0.0	0.00
Mourning Warbler	1					
MacGillivray's Warbler	1					
Common Yellowthroat	4			0.7	0.0	0.00
Wilson's Warbler		1				
Unidentified Warbler		1				
Summer Tanager	8		2	1.5	0.2	0.13
Northern Cardinal	88	12	55	15.5	6.3	0.41
Indigo Bunting	7	1	3	0.7	0.6	0.75
Painted Bunting	73	7	42	15.9	2.0	0.13
Brown-headed Cowbird	1		2	0.4	0.0	0.00
ALL SPECIES POOLED	400	59	195	58.5	28.1	0.48
Total Number of Captures		654				
Number of Species	24	15	9	16	12	
Total Number of Species		30			18	

¹ Reproductive index (young/adult) is undefined because no adults of this species were captured.

Table 5. Estimates of adult annual survival and recapture probabilities and proportion of residents among newly captured adults using a time-constant model for seven species breeding at MAPS stations on Camp Swift* obtained from 12 years (1994-2005) of mark-recapture data.

Species	Num. sta. ^{2,1}	Num. ind. ²	Num. caps. ³	Num. ret. ⁴	Survival probability ⁵	Surv. C.V. ⁶	Recapture probability ⁷	Proportion of residents ⁸
White-eyed Vireo	3	581	997	147	0.570 (0.034)	6.0	0.424 (0.044)	0.481 (0.069)
Tufted Titmouse †	3	77	106	14	0.511 (0.110)	21.5	0.207 (0.106)	1.000 (0.542)
Carolina Wren	3	268	419	40	0.435 (0.064)	14.7	0.297 (0.079)	0.685 (0.203)
Summer Tanager	3	72	89	11	0.610 (0.113)	18.6	0.264 (0.124)	0.418 (0.231)
Northern Cardinal	3	724	1164	219	0.574 (0.027)	4.7	0.375 (0.034)	0.678 (0.078)
Painted Bunting	3	488	752	119	0.528 (0.039)	7.5	0.497 (0.055)	0.497 (0.079)

¹ Number of stations where the species was a regular or usual breeder and at which adults of the species were captured. Stations within one km of each other were combined into a single super-station to prevent individuals whose home ranges included portions of two or more stations from being counted as multiple individuals.

² Number of adult individuals captured at stations where the species was a regular or usual breeder (i.e., number of capture histories).

³ Total number of captures of adult birds of the species at stations where the species was a regular or usual breeder.

⁴ Total number of returns. A return is the first recapture in a given year of a bird originally banded at the same station in a previous year.

⁵ Survival probability (ϕ) presented as the maximum likelihood estimate (standard error of the estimate).

⁶ The coefficient of variation for survival probability, $CV(\phi)$.

⁷ Recapture probability (p) presented as the maximum likelihood estimate (standard error of the estimate).

⁸ The proportion of residents among newly captured adults (τ) presented as the maximum likelihood estimate (standard error of the estimate).

† The estimate for recapture probability (and possibly survival probability as well) may be biased low because the estimate for τ was 1.000.

* Data from the Dropzone station was not included in this analysis because the station has not yet operated the minimum four years necessary for inclusion in survivorship analysis. Data from the McLaughlin Creek station (last year of operation was 2003) was included in this analysis.

Table 6. Summary of the 2005 MAPS program on Camp Bowie.

Station			Major Habitat Type	Latitude-longitude	Avg Elev. (m)	2005 operation		
Name	Code	No.				Total number of net-hours ¹	No. of periods	Inclusive dates
Mesquite Flat	MESQ	14446	Disturbed open mesquite savannah, open cedar/elm woodland	31°38'59"N,98°54'31"W	396	423.7 (381.0)	9	5/23 - 8/01
Devil's Hill	DEVI	14447	Live oak/post oak savannah, open mesquite savannah	31°37'06"N,98°53'39"W	424	389.0 (380.3)	9	5/18 - 8/02
Stonehouse	STON	14442	Live oak savannah, riparian areas	31°35'41"N,98°54'27"W	442	371.0 (360.8)	9	5/22 - 7/30
Bedrock	BEDR	14445	Mixed oak woodland, mesquite savannah	31°38'37"N,98°56'10"W	442	565.2 (558.7)	9	5/20 - 8/04
Mockingbird Lane	MOCK	14444	Arid oak/juniper highland	31°36'16"N,98°55'25"W	479	414.5 (414.5)	9	5/21 - 7/31
Nighthawk	NIGH	14443	Open oak woodland	31°37'15"N,98°57'00"W	485	427.5 (426.5)	9	5/19 - 8/03
ALL STATIONS COMBINED						2590.8(2521.8)	9	5/31 - 8/01

¹ Total net-hours in 2005. Net-hours in 2005 that could be compared in a constant-effort manner to 2004 are shown in parentheses.

Table 7. Capture summary for the six individual MAPS stations operated on Camp Bowie in 2005.
 N = Newly Banded, U = Unbanded, R = Recaptures of banded birds.

Species	Mesquite Flat			Devil's Hill			Stonehouse			Bedrock			Mockingbird Lane			Nighthawk		
	N	U	R	N	U	R	N	U	R	N	U	R	N	U	R	N	U	R
Mourning Dove		1																
Inca Dove					1													
Common Ground-Dove					1													
Yellow-billed Cuckoo	1		1	2	1					3		1				1		
Ruby-throated Hummingbird											1							
Black-chinned Hummingbird		2			2			1			3							
Unidentified Hummingbird		1			1			4			1		1			1		
Golden-fronted Woodpecker	3		1															
Ladder-backed Woodpecker	5		2				1						1					2
Downy Woodpecker	2																	
Eastern Phoebe				1						1								
Ash-throated Flycatcher	1		1								1							
Great Crested Flycatcher	1										1							
Western Kingbird											1							
Scissor-tailed Flycatcher	2																	
Carolina Chickadee	5			2						2	3	2	4					
Black-crested Titmouse	3		2	7		2	5			3	1	4	2			7		2
Carolina Wren	1						1			2		2						
Bewick's Wren	10		5	14	1	5	5		4	7	2	4	4			9	1	5
Eastern Bluebird	11	1																
Northern Mockingbird	3						2		1									
Black-and-white Warbler													1					
Summer Tanager	5			2			2			5	2	4				4		2
Canyon Towhee							2											
Rufous-crowned Sparrow				4		10			1	1						5	1	2

Table 7. (cont.) Capture summary for the six individual MAPS stations operated on Camp Bowie in 2005.
 N = Newly Banded, U = Unbanded, R = Recaptures of banded birds.

Species	Mesquite Flat			Devil's Hill			Stonehouse			Bedrock			Mockingbird Lane			Nighthawk		
	N	U	R	N	U	R	N	U	R	N	U	R	N	U	R	N	U	R
Field Sparrow						1	3	2	1				2		1	4		3
Lark Sparrow											1					1		
Unidentified Sparrow					1													
Northern Cardinal		2	1	4	2	7	16	8	5	1	5		6	3	2	7	1	2
Painted Bunting	8	1	4	20	3	10	15	1	8	6	1	7	8	1	6	5		5
Brown-headed Cowbird	1		1							1	2					1		
ALL SPECIES POOLED	62	8	18	56	13	35	52	16	21	33	23	24	28	5	9	44	4	23
Total Number of Captures		88			104			89			80			42			71	
Number of Species	16	6	9	9	9	6	10	5	7	11	13	7	8	3	3	10	4	8
Total Number of Species		20			15			14			18			9			12	

Table 8. Numbers of adult and young individual birds captured per 600 net-hours and reproductive index (young/adult) at the six individual MAPS stations operated on Camp Bowie in 2005.

Species	Mesquite Flat			Devil's Hill			Stonehouse			Bedrock			Mockingbird Lane			Nighthawk		
	Ad.	Yg.	Repr. index	Ad.	Yg.	Repr. index	Ad.	Yg.	Repr. index	Ad.	Yg.	Repr. index	Ad.	Yg.	Repr. index	Ad.	Yg.	Repr. index
Yellow-billed Cuckoo	1.4	0.0	0.00	4.6	0.0	0.00				3.2	0.0	0.00				1.4	0.0	0.00
Golden-fronted Woodpecker	4.2	0.0	0.00															
Ladder-backed Woodpecker	5.7	4.2	0.75				0.0	1.6	und. ¹				0.0	1.4	und. ¹	1.4	0.0	0.00
Downy Woodpecker	2.8	0.0	0.00															
Eastern Phoebe				0.0	1.5	und. ¹				0.0	1.1	und. ¹						
Ash-throated Flycatcher	1.4	0.0	0.00							0.0	0.0	0.00						
Great Crested Flycatcher	1.4	0.0	0.00															
Western Kingbird										0.0	0.0	0.00						
Scissor-tailed Flycatcher	1.4	1.4	1.00															
Carolina Chickadee	1.4	5.7	4.00	0.0	3.1	und.				2.1	2.1	1.00	0.0	5.8	und.			
Black-crested Titmouse	2.8	2.8	1.00	4.6	9.3	2.00	3.2	4.9	1.50	2.1	3.2	1.50	0.0	2.9	und.	4.2	7.0	1.67
Carolina Wren	0.0	1.4	und. ¹				0.0	1.6	und.	1.1	2.1	2.00						
Bewick's Wren	5.7	8.5	1.50	10.8	15.4	1.43	8.1	6.5	0.80	3.2	5.3	1.67	1.4	4.3	3.00	5.6	9.8	1.75
Eastern Bluebird	9.9	5.7	0.57															
Northern Mockingbird	4.2	0.0	0.00				3.2	0.0	0.00									
Summer Tanager	7.1	0.0	0.00	3.1	0.0	0.00	3.2	0.0	0.00	8.5	0.0	0.00				7.0	0.0	0.00
Canyon Towhee							3.2	0.0	0.00									
Rufous-crowned Sparrow				9.3	1.5	0.17	1.6	0.0	0.00	1.1	0.0	0.00				7.0	0.0	0.00
Field Sparrow				1.5	0.0	0.00	4.9	0.0	0.00				4.3	0.0	0.00	8.4	0.0	0.00
Lark Sparrow										0.0	0.0	0.00				1.4	0.0	0.00
Northern Cardinal	1.4	0.0	0.00	9.3	6.2	0.67	24.3	4.9	0.20	1.1	0.0	0.00	8.7	0.0	0.00	9.8	0.0	0.00
Painted Bunting	14.2	0.0	0.00	18.5	21.6	1.17	30.7	0.0	0.00	7.4	1.1	0.14	14.5	2.9	0.20	5.6	4.2	0.75
Brown-headed Cowbird	2.8	0.0	0.00				1.6	0.0	0.00	2.1	0.0	0.00				1.4	0.0	0.00

Table 8. (cont.) Numbers of adult and young individual birds captured per 600 net-hours and reproductive index (young/adult) at the six individual MAPS stations operated on Camp Bowie in 2005.

Species	Mesquite Flat			Devil's Hill			Stonehouse			Bedrock			Mockingbird Lane			Nighthawk		
	Ad.	Yg.	Repr. index	Ad.	Yg.	Repr. index	Ad.	Yg.	Repr. index	Ad.	Yg.	Repr. index	Ad.	Yg.	Repr. index	Ad.	Yg.	Repr. index
ALL SPECIES POOLED	68.0	29.7	0.44	61.7	58.6	0.95	84.1	19.4	0.23	31.8	14.9	0.47	29.0	17.4	0.60	53.3	21.1	0.40
Number of Species	16	7		8	7		10	5		10	6		4	5		11	3	
Total Number of Species		17			10			12			11			7			11	

¹ Reproductive index (young/adult) is undefined because no adults of this species were captured at this station in this year.

Table 9. Summary of results for all six Camp Bowie MAPS stations combined in 2005.

Species	Birds captured			Birds/600 nethours		Reprod. Index
	Newly banded	Un-banded	Recap-tured	Adults	Young	
Mourning Dove		1				
Inca Dove		1				
Common Ground-Dove		1				
Yellow-billed Cuckoo	7	1	2	1.9	0.0	0.00
Ruby-throated Hummingbird		1				
Black-chinned Hummingbird		8				
Unidentified Hummingbird		9				
Golden-fronted Woodpecker	3		1	0.7	0.0	0.00
Ladder-backed Woodpecker	7		4	1.2	1.2	1.00
Downy Woodpecker	2			0.5	0.0	0.00
Eastern Phoebe	2			0.0	0.5	und. ¹
Ash-throated Flycatcher	1	1	1	0.2	0.0	0.00
Great Crested Flycatcher	1	1		0.2	0.0	0.00
Western Kingbird		1		0.0	0.0	und.
Scissor-tailed Flycatcher	2			0.2	0.2	1.00
Carolina Chickadee	13	3	2	0.7	2.8	4.00
Black-crested Titmouse	27	1	10	2.8	4.9	1.75
Carolina Wren	4		2	0.2	0.9	4.00
Bewick's Wren	49	4	23	5.6	8.1	1.46
Eastern Bluebird	11	1		1.6	0.9	0.57
Northern Mockingbird	5		1	1.2	0.0	0.00
Black-and-white Warbler	1					
Summer Tanager	18	2	6	5.1	0.0	0.00
Canyon Towhee	2			0.5	0.0	0.00
Rufous-crowned Sparrow	10	1	13	3.0	0.2	0.08
Field Sparrow	9	2	6	3.0	0.0	0.00
Lark Sparrow	1	1		0.2	0.0	0.00
Unidentified Sparrow		1				
Northern Cardinal	34	21	17	8.3	1.6	0.19
Painted Bunting	62	7	40	14.4	4.6	0.32
Brown-headed Cowbird	4		2	1.4	0.0	0.00
ALL SPECIES POOLED	275	69	130	52.8	25.9	0.49
Total Number of Captures		474				
Number of Species	23	19	15	21	11	
Total Number of Species		29			22	

¹ Reproductive index (young/adult) is undefined because no adults of this species were captured at this location in this year.

Table 10. Estimates of adult annual survival and recapture probabilities and proportion of residents among newly captured adults using a time-constant model for 14 species breeding at MAPS stations on Camp Bowie obtained from 12 years (1994-2005) of mark-recapture data.

Species	Num. sta. ^{2,1}	Num. ind. ²	Num. caps. ³	Num. ret. ⁴	Survival probability ⁵	Surv. C.V. ⁶	Recapture probability ⁷	Proportion of residents ⁸
Yellow-billed Cuckoo	6	175	204	13	0.457 (0.111)	24.4	0.345 (0.149)	0.230 (0.121)
Ladder-backed Woodpecker	5	52	81	21	0.624 (0.096)	15.3	0.502 (0.120)	0.571 (0.202)
Great Crested Flycatcher ‡	2	26	31	4	0.782 (0.212)	27.2	0.174 (0.151)	0.365 (0.384)
Carolina Chickadee	6	96	110	5	0.368 (0.180)	48.8	0.159 (0.171)	0.568 (0.610)
Black-crested Titmouse †	6	210	292	40	0.504 (0.065)	12.9	0.214 (0.065)	1.000 (0.325)
Bewick's Wren	6	287	410	45	0.369 (0.056)	15.0	0.647 (0.107)	0.343 (0.094)
Northern Mockingbird	6	229	287	15	0.280 (0.096)	34.4	0.213 (0.132)	0.798 (0.496)
Summer Tanager	4	100	145	25	0.602 (0.082)	13.6	0.346 (0.097)	0.653 (0.226)
Rufous-crowned Sparrow	3	88	140	15	0.463 (0.104)	22.4	0.382 (0.143)	0.559 (0.260)
Field Sparrow	5	150	206	25	0.529 (0.085)	16.0	0.228 (0.085)	0.777 (0.315)
Lark Sparrow ‡†	3	57	61	2	0.694 (0.254)	36.5	0.020 (0.054)	1.000 (2.694)
Northern Cardinal	6	342	556	91	0.504 (0.044)	8.7	0.376 (0.057)	0.809 (0.150)
Painted Bunting	6	439	657	105	0.666 (0.041)	6.1	0.443 (0.050)	0.335 (0.055)
Brown-headed Cowbird	6	117	178	24	0.518 (0.079)	15.3	0.266 (0.089)	0.762 (0.288)

¹ Number of stations where the species was a regular or usual breeder and at which adults of the species were captured. Stations within one km of each other were combined into a single super-station to prevent individuals whose home ranges included portions of two or more stations from being counted as multiple individuals.

² Number of adult individuals captured at stations where the species was a regular or usual breeder (i.e., number of capture histories).

³ Total number of captures of adult birds of the species at stations where the species was a regular or usual breeder.

⁴ Total number of returns. A return is the first recapture in a given year of a bird originally banded at the same station in a previous year.

⁵ Survival probability (ϕ) presented as the maximum likelihood estimate (standard error of the estimate).

⁶ The coefficient of variation for survival probability, $CV(\phi)$.

⁷ Recapture probability (p) presented as the maximum likelihood estimate (standard error of the estimate).

⁸ The proportion of residents among newly captured adults (τ) presented as the maximum likelihood estimate (standard error of the estimate).

‡ The estimate for survival probability should be viewed with caution because it is based on fewer than five between-year recaptures, or the estimate is very imprecise ($SE(\phi) > 0.200$ or $CV(\phi) > 50.0\%$).

† The estimate for recapture probability (and possibly survival probability as well) may be biased low because the estimate for τ was 1.000.