Zach Peery
Assistant Professor
Department of Forest and Wildlife Ecology
120 Russell Laboratories, 1630 Linden Drive
Madison WI 53706-1598 USA
ph: (+1) 608-890-2766 fax: (+1) 608-262-9922
http://forest.wisc.edu

October 7, 2013

Below is a list of edits made by Douglas Tempel (Project Leader) to the Final 2012 Annual Report for the Eldorado Study Area based on comments by Patti Krueger of the US Forest Service. Comments are in plain text, responses to comments are in bold. The draft report was submitted on March 31, 2013. The request for edits was received on June 3, 2013 and the revised (final) draft was submitted on June 5, 2013. The final draft was approved for release on July 26, 2013.

Comments and Responses:

Please make the Appendix (draft in press, do not release document) a references as it is now final in press. It need not be an appendix. At each point the appendix is referenced, make it a reference. **Done.**

Page 2: Abstract: "We recently determined that survey coverage of the entire EDSA was not achieved until 1993 because funding constraints precluded hiring sufficient personnel (Tempel and Gutierrez, in press; attached as Appendix A)." Since this is not a key point in the report, it should be removed from the abstract. Or in reverse, if it is a key point, it needs to be sufficiently discussed in the body of the document.
I think it has been sufficiently discussed in the document: on p. 9 of the Methods ("Sampling issues with mark-recapture data") and on p. 15 of the Discussion. I now report the results of Tempel and Gutierrez (2013) on p. 9 to conform to what has been stated in the Abstract.

Page 8: top paragraph: "254 cm year per year" probably should read "254 cm per year".
Done.

Page 8, second paragraph: "Montane Manzanita (Arctostaphylos spp.). Chaparral,…" – should be a comma not a period following the parenthesis.
Done.

Page 14, last paragraph, under Population Rate of Change: "The random-effects means model suggested that the population was declining by 2% per year, but the 95% confidence interval for <lambda time> overlapped zero…" – I think you mean it overlapped "one", not "zero".
Done.

Page 15, first paragraph, under Population Rate of Change: last sentence, word – same issue as above – overlapped "one" not "zero.
Done.

Page 16, last paragraph, Acknowledgements: "funding from 1994-2011…" should be "funding from 1994-2012"
Done.

Page 27, Table 6, Caption: Year range should start at 1990, not 1991, as in previous years reports. Data should be reflective.
We did not use reproductive data from 1990 because too few birds were assessed for reproduction (see the first full paragraph of p. 10). This is consistent with our analyses in previous reports, but the Table captions on previous reports were incorrect.

Page 29, Table 8, Caption: Year range should be through 2012, not 2011 here. Data should be reflective.
The last survival estimate is for 2011 (i.e., survival from 2011 to 2012). There is no survival estimate for 2012. Again, this is consistent with our analyses in previous reports, but the Table captions on previous reports were incorrect.

Page 30, Table 9, Caption: Year range should be through 2011, not 2010. Data should be reflective.
The range is correct as listed. As with survival, there is no lambda estimate for 2012. Lambda estimates were produced for 1992-2010 (see p. 11 where we state that "We did not include the first two and the last estimates of λ_t because they may have been confounded with estimation of φ_t"). Again, this is consistent with our analyses in previous reports, but the Table captions on previous reports were incorrect.

Page 33, Figure 3, Caption: Year range should be starting at 1990 as in previous years reports. Data should be reflective.
As stated above, we did not use reproductive data from 1990. The Figure captions on previous reports were incorrect.

Page 34, Figure 4, Caption: Same issue as above – Year range should be starting at 1990. Data should be reflective.
This figure shows the estimates from a random-effects model that has a year effect for both survival and recapture probability (p). It turned out that the best structure for p this year contained a year effect. As a result, the first two and the last estimates of survival are confounded with p (this is the same situation we have with the lambda modeling). I actually should not have included the value for 2011, so I've revised the figure to show the values for 1992-2010. I've added an explanation on p. 14 ("The best structure for p included a year effect (t). Thus, we did not include the first two and the last estimates of φ_t because they were confounded with estimation of p_t".) and to the caption in Figure 4.

Page 25, Figure 5, Caption: <lambda time> is given in the report, hence it is not clear why it is not given here in the graph and that the explanation is not reflected within the writing of the text. On page 14, <lambda time> is given as .98. Please reflect that in the caption and in the Figure.
It's not clear to me what you're saying here. On p. 14, the value of 0.98 is an average value estimated from the individual lambda estimates. I've changed the last sentence on p. 14 in an attempt to clarify this. The figure shows the actual variation each year in the lambda estimates,

and the line shows the value for a hypothetical stationary population (as indicated in the caption).

Sincerely,

Zach Peery