



Kirtland's Warbler Recovery Team

JOHN BYELICH, Leader
Mio, Michigan

NELS I. JOHNSON
Mich. Dept. of
Natural Resources

HAROLD F. MAYFIELD
Waterville, Ohio

ROBERT E. RADTKE
U. S. Forest Service

GEORGE W. IRVINE
U. S. Forest Service

WESLEY R. JONES
Hudson, Wisconsin

WILLIAM J. MAHALAK
Mich. Dept. of
Natural Resources

MICHAEL E. DeCAPITA
U.S. Fish and
Wildlife Service

February 21, 1985

Mr. Charles J. Guenther, Chief
Wildlife Division
Department of Natural Resources
Box 30028
Lansing, Michigan 48909

Dear Mr. Guenther:

We understand that the U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) shortly will be approaching its approved Kirtland's warbler land acquisition ceiling of 4,500 acres. The "Management Plan for Kirtland's Warbler Habitat in Michigan," jointly approved in 1981 by the U. S. Forest Service and Michigan Department of Natural Resources, established a goal to acquire 7,661 acres of land by the State to achieve the objectives of the Recovery Plan.

A number of high priority tracts have not been acquired due to unwilling sellers. These tracts were anticipated to produce high nesting density habitat. We believe that the USFWS's 4,500 acreage ceiling should be raised to allow sufficient latitude to acquire all the parcels currently designated as priority acquisition by the Recovery Plan.

Our recommendation is that the Michigan Department of Natural Resources request the USFWS to raise the acreage ceiling and to continue the acquisition of priority tracts detailed in the Plan. A precise acreage goal can be determined by your staff based upon the remaining unacquired priority tracts.

Sincerely,

John Byelich, Leader
Kirtland's Warbler Recovery Team

JB:sp



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

North Central Forest Experiment Station
1992 Folwell Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Reply to: 1630

Date: July 25, 1985

Mr. Harold Mayfield
9235 River Road
Waterville, OH 43566

Dear Harold:

Jack Hayes and I have finally completed a review draft of our paper on KW pairing success in different habitats. We concluded that there is a highly significant difference in the time necessary to determine mated males in poorer habitat, although we do not presume that all of these males were in fact unmated for the entire breeding season. We acknowledge that our search time was adequate only for habitat comparisons, and suggest that future researchers extend search time farther out on the curve of diminishing returns.

Our observation and tracking times may seem to be marginal, but that is because we avoided working at times when singing was poor, or in habitat where visibility was poor. For example, if the ratio of track time to observation time fell below 20%, it is conceivable that one could spend 7-8 hours or more to find a female KW. Our conclusions do not depend as much on the accuracy of the pairing determination as they do on the difference in proportion of "unmated" males in each habitat.

We would like to ask you to review this paper if you have a chance in the next month or so. I also wish to thank you for your review of the "Factors Limiting" paper last year. It has been accepted by Amer. Midl. Nat. and should appear in print next year. If you are unable to review the "Pairing Success" paper you are welcome to keep it for your information.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. PROBST
Wildlife Biologist

Enclosure



