

## Vulnerability of bird communities in small mid-field afforestations: searching for a hierarchy of factors



Krzysztof Kujawa, Res. Centre for Agric. & Forest Envir., Pol. Acad.of Sciences, ortolan@poczta.onet.pl

## INTRODUCTION

· Habitats of an agricultural landscape are subject to permanent, negative changes, which in consequence lead to reduction of biodiversity.

 It is well known that mosaic, differentiated structure of agricultural landscape (especially presence of afforestations) markedly provide for preservation of different groups of animals, including birds. • However, the size of those afforestations is usually relatively small. that is why natural processes are strongly influenced by adjacent areas. · In most studies (in Poland as well as in other countries) the efforts were focused to the importance of structure of afforestations (their size, shape, vegetation etc.), ignoring the effects of environmental factors characterising near adjacent areas.

### AIM OF STUDY

The aim of the study was to verify importance of three classes of factors for avifauna of small mid-field afforestations, i.e. factors related to:

> structure of afforestation,

> structure habitat in neighborhood,

> structure of landscape.

Expected result of the research: recognition of a hierarchy of the importance of defined classes of factors, and better understanding the mechanisms, which shape avifauna of small mid-field woodland islands. It can contribute for enhancing effectiveness of planting new afforestations in terms of their importance for biodiversity preservation.

## Bird community of studied afforestations:

> 61 breeding species, total bird density - 15,1 pairs/ha

> Average bird density per plot - from 4,4 to 47,9 p/ha

Average number of species per plot per year - from 1 to 18

> Total number of species per plot per year - from 3 to 27

> Most common (recorded in more then 50% of plots) species : F. coelebs, E. citrinella, T. merula, S. atricapilla, P. major, H. icterina, P. caeruleus, C. carduelis and M. striata.

Most rare (recorded in single plots) species: T. pilaris, S. rubetra, P. modularis, P. pica, P. perdix, L. naevia, L. fluviatilis, J. torquilla, D. martius, C. oenas, A. atthis, A. scirpaceus.

Most abundant species (dominance >5%): F. coelebs, S. atricapilla, E. citrinella, H. icterina and T. merula.



## Influence of habitat structure on species richness and abundance in "habitat-guilds" Determination coefficients of step-wise regression model in respect to .habitat-guidk": EDGE. Birds of forest-crops ecotone, W\_EDGE. Birds of margin of forest, W\_ALL - Forest birds without any preferences to margin or interior, W\_IN - Birds of interior of forest, S - number of species, D - bird density

Habitat-guild	Structure of afforestation	Structure of neighborhood	Structure of landscape
EDGE_S	32		9
EDGE_D	35		26
W_EDGE_S	49		19
W_EDGE_D	33		-
W_ALL_S	68		33
W_ALL_D	45	9	42
W IN S	32		11
WIND	23	5	10

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Variability of species number and bird density was most strongly Variability of spectre number and our density was most strongly related to structure of afforestations. Landscape structure influenced avifauna usually less (several-fold) then afforestation structure. Only for W\_ALL and EDGE the effect of landscape structure was almost the same as the effect of afforestation structure. Effect of structure of habitat in neighborhood was very weak. The influence of habitat structure on community dynamics was relatively small. on hadrat structure on community dynamics was relatively share what suggests that changes in bird community in such small afforestations is random process or they are dependent on other factors, which have not been identified in this study.







## METHODS

Bird population density has been estimated with the aid of mapping method. Each plot was visited 9 times per breeding season, since 1.04 to 10.07. Duration of single visit in one plot (one afforestation) - 20-80 min.

From the Duration of single that in the provide indecision (2006) init.
Structure of afforestation has been characterised by 16 variables (qualitative, such as species composition of tree-stand, type of tree-stand, water conditions etc. and quantitative, such as area of afforestation, percentage cover of vegetation layers etc.) on the basis of field work and analysis of aerial photographs as well as maps.

· Neighborhood has been defined as the land adjacent to border-line o Neighborhood has been defined as the land adjacent to border-line of afforestation distant up to 50 m from the border-line, defined by MapInfo on the basis of aerial photographs. Structure of neighborhood (percentage of habitats and number of habitat patches) has been analysed with the aid of a software AreaMeasure. Finally, for further analyses 10 quantitative variables have been used, such as share of grasslands, cereals, diversity index (H') and mean area of habitat patches.

Analysis of landscape structure around given afforestation has been done in respect to a circle with the radius of 1,5 km from central point of afforestation, with the aid of actial photographs. The structure of landscape has been analysed by MapInfo and AreaMeasure and finally 20 variables have been defined (H<sup>-</sup>, share of habitats, habitat patch number, wood isolation index (Gustafson i Parker 1994) etc.).

• In order to reduce number of independent variables a principal factor analysis has been performed, but only if combined variance represented by principal factors amounted to more then 75%. Finally, number of variables describing neighborhood has been reduced to 3, and number of variables characterising structure of landscape - to 11.

· All statistical analyses have been done with the aid of Statistica 5.5.



# Influence of habitat structure on the rate of local extinction of breeding species

