EPA Public Access

Author manuscript

J Field Ornithol. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2018 June 01.

About author manuscripts

Submit a manuscript

Published in final edited form as:

J Field Ornithol. 2017 June 1; 88(2): 115–131. doi:10.1111/jofo.12199.

Factors that influence vital rates of Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrows in coastal New Jersey, USA

Samuel G. Roberts¹, Rebecca A. Longenecker², Matthew A. Etterson³, Katharine J. Ruskin^{4,5}, Chris S. Elphick⁴, Brian J. Olsen⁵, and W. Gregory Shriver^{1,6}

¹Department of Entomology and Wildlife Ecology, University of Delaware, 251 Townsend Hall, Newark, Delaware 19716, USA

²U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Northeast Regional Office, 300 Westgate Center Drive Hadley, Massachusetts 01035, USA

³U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory, Mid Continent Ecology Division, 6201 Congdon Boulevard, Duluth, Minnesota 55804, USA

⁴Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, Center for Conservation and Biodiversity, University of Connecticut and Institute of Biological Risk, 75 North Eagleville Road, U-43, Storrs, Connecticut 06269, USA

⁵School of Biology and Ecology and Climate Change Institute, University of Maine, 200 Clapp Greenhouse, Orono, Maine 04469, USA

Abstract

As saltmarsh habitat continues to disappear, understanding the factors that influence saltmarsh breeding bird population dynamics is an important step for the conservation of these declining species. Using five years (2011 – 2015) of demographic data, we evaluated and compared Seaside (*Ammodramus maritimus*) and Saltmarsh (*A. caudacutus*) sparrow apparent adult survival and nest survival at the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge, New Jersey, USA. We determined the effect of site management history (unditched vs. ditched marsh) on adult and nest survival to aid in prioritizing future management or restoration actions. Seaside Sparrow apparent adult survival (61.6%, 95% CI: 52.5 – 70.0%) averaged >1.5 times greater than Saltmarsh Sparrow apparent adult survival (39.9%, 95% CI: 34.0 – 46.2%). Nest survival and predation and flooding rates did not differ between species, and predation was the primary cause of failure for both species. Apparent adult survival and nest survival did not differ between unditched and ditched marshes for either species, indicating that marsh ditching history may not affect breeding habitat quality for these species. With predation as the primary cause of nest failure for both species in New Jersey, we suggest that future research should focus on identification of predator communities in salt marshes and the potential for implementing predator-control programs to limit population declines.

⁶Corresponding author. gshriver@udel.edu.

Keywords

adult survival; *Ammodramus caudacutus*; *Ammodramus maritimus*; ditching; nest survival; predator control; salt marsh; sparrow

Understanding demographic processes is fundamental to managing wildlife populations because robust vital rates are critical to accurately estimating population trajectories. Vital rate estimates are essential for setting harvest rates (Messier 1991, Gaillard et al. 1998, Sandercock et al. 2008) and for identifying factors limiting population growth (Sather and Bakke 2000, Taylor et al. 2012). A detailed understanding of demographic parameters is especially important for population viability models used to evaluate the long-term persistence of declining wildlife populations (Akçakaya 2000, Reed et al. 2002). Long-term demographic studies are logistically challenging, but are especially important for the conservation of threatened populations. Presently, estimating vital rates is particularly pertinent to species vulnerable to rapid climate change and will allow for better modeling of the factors that may aid in maintaining sensitive species through this climatic shift.

Salt marshes are considered highly threatened by global climate change, and thus the wildlife that depend on salt marshes are conservation priorities (Rosenberg et al. 2016). Salt marshes are limited to ~45,000 km² globally, and one third of salt marshes worldwide occur along the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts of North America (Greenberg et al. 2006a). Salt marshes have been degraded and fragmented by urban, residential, agricultural and commercial development, livestock grazing, invasive species encroachment, pollution, sea level rise, and grid-ditching for mosquito control (Gedan et al. 2009, Craft et al. 2009, Altieri et al. 2012, Deegan et al. 2012, Coverdale et al. 2013). Accelerated rates of sea-level rise, due to anthropogenic climate change during the 19th century, will continue through the 20th century at a more rapid pace than occurred in the past 2700 years (Kopp et al. 2016). As sea levels and storm frequencies increase (Knutson et al. 1998, McCabe et al. 2001, Elsner et al. 2008, Bender et al. 2010), salt marshes will continue to be degraded, altered, or lost (Goodbred and Hine 1995, Michener et al. 1997, Scavia et al. 2002, Cahoon 2006).

Seaside (*Ammodramus maritimus*) and Saltmarsh (*A. caudacutus*) sparrows are restricted almost entirely to salt marshes throughout their ranges (Greenlaw and Rising 1994, Post and Greenlaw 1994), making them among the most vulnerable species to rapid habitat changes caused by changing climate. Seaside Sparrows breed from Texas through southern Maine (Post and Greenlaw 1994), are listed globally as a species of least concern (BirdLife International 2015), and as a species of moderate priority in Bird Conservation Region 30 (BCR 30, defined as the Mid-Atlantic and New England Coast; Rosenberg et al. 2016). In the northeastern United States, the Seaside Sparrow population is estimated to be 230,000 (174,000–286,000) individuals (Wiest et al. 2016), with a fairly stable population trend in recent decades (Correll et al. 2017). The breeding range of Saltmarsh Sparrows extends from Virginia to southern Maine (Greenlaw and Rising 1994), with an estimated global population of 53,000 (37,000–69,000) individuals (Wiest et al. 2016). Saltmarsh Sparrows are listed as globally vulnerable (BirdLife International 2012), are a species of highest

priority in BCR 30 (Rosenberg et al. 2016), and recent population trend estimates indicate a 9% annual decline (Correll et al. 2016).

Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrows differ in their life-history traits in ways that may influence their responses to different threats. Therefore, comparison of the vital rates where they co-occur may be critical to determining the best management actions to maintain breeding populations through this period of rapid climate shift. Seaside Sparrows typically place nests between 14 – 28 cm above ground in marsh areas dominated by *Spartina alterniflora* (Post and Greenlaw 1994). In contrast, Saltmarsh Sparrows place nests 2 – 10 cm above ground in marsh areas dominated by *Spartina patens* (Greenlaw and Rising 1994, Greenberg et al. 2006b). Although the relatively high placement of Seaside Sparrow nests reduces flooding events (Gjerdrum et al. 2005), their nesting success is still affected by flooding (Greenberg et al. 2006b). Differences in nest heights above the ground do not indicate relative flooding risks because *S. alterniflora* grows at lower elevations than *S. patens* (Bertness 1999). Saltmarsh Sparrow nest success is strongly influenced by short-term flooding events driven by the timing of nest initiation in relation to lunar tide cycles (Gjerdrum et al. 2005, Shriver et al. 2007) and nest structure (Humphreys et al. 2007).

Here, we present estimates of apparent annual adult survival, nest survival rates, and relative rates of nest failure for Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrows in an unditched salt marsh and ditched marshes based on five years (2011 – 2015) of mark-recapture and nest-monitoring data. Our first objective was to directly compare the apparent annual adult survival and nest survival rates of Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrows. Our second objective was to determine if Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrow vital rates differed between the unditched and ditched marshes. Grid-ditching of salt marshes for mosquito control was ubiquitous during the 1930s and persists as the dominant structural alteration to salt marshes, especially along the Atlantic Coast of the United States where >90% of the salt marshes are grid-ditched (Bourn and Cottam 1950). Grid-ditching affects saltmarsh hydrology and elevation, thus altering natural processes in marsh systems (Wolfe 1996, Tonjes 2013) by reducing water on the marsh surface, draining ponds, and lowering the water table throughout the marsh (Daiber 1986, Dale and Hulsman 1990, Wolfe 1996, Adamowicz and Roman 2005, Tonjes 2013). Decreasing the presence of water on the marsh surface may potentially lead to reduced nest flooding for both Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrows. Ditching also increases marsh surface elevation through sediment deposition from within ditches during flooding events (Wolfe 1996). In New Jersey, increased marsh surface elevation can lead to a shift in the dominant vegetation from *S. alterniflora* to *S. patens* (Bertness 1991), favoring breeding Saltmarsh Sparrows by increasing the availability of optimal nesting habitat. Despite the prevalence of ditches, ecosystem-wide effects of ditch presence are still unclear, and the impact of ditches on specific taxa and individual species is largely unknown (Gedan et al. 2009). We compared vital rates of both species in unditched and ditched salt marshes. Finally, our third objective was to identify the factors influencing apparent adult and nest survival rates for each species.

METHODS

Study site

We conducted this research at Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge (hereafter, Forsythe NWR) in coastal New Jersey (39.7531757° N –74.1376367° W). Wiest et al. (2016) estimated that coastal New Jersey hosts 23% of the northeastern population of breeding Seaside Sparrows and 38% of the global population of breeding Saltmarsh Sparrows. With 15,000 ha of salt marsh (U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2004), Forsythe NWR is an important breeding area for both Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrows (Wiest et al. 2016). Saltmarsh vegetation at Forsythe NWR is dominated by saltmeadow cordgrass (*S. patens*), smooth cordgrass (*S. alterniflora*), inland saltgrass (*Distichlis spicata*), and Jesuit's bark (*Iva frutescens*). In 2011, we established three study sites (AT&T, Oyster Creek, and Mullica Wilderness) and sampled them annually through 2015 (Fig. 1). These sites experienced different levels of degradation from human activity. AT&T (14 ha; 39.697191° N –74.214032° W) and Oyster Creek (18 ha; 39.504815° N –74.426283° W) were grid-ditched and both sites were partially bordered by forest and a road. These sites were also further modified by open-marsh water management (OMWM) for mosquito control during the past several decades. Mullica Wilderness (17 ha; 39.536166° N –74.438021° W) was not managed with either grid-ditching or OMWM and was bordered by salt marsh and open water. All three sites contained similar densities of breeding Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrows (Kern 2015).

Estimating annual apparent adult survival: data collection

We used mark-recapture to estimate annual apparent adult survival of Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrows. To control for sampling effort, we systematically captured and marked sparrows at each site 12 times from mid-May through mid-August 2011 – 2015 (Ruskin et al. 2016). We initiated systematic sessions at sunrise and operated 12 mist-nets (12 × 2.6 m, 30-mm mesh) for three hours. We banded every sparrow captured with one U.S.G.S. aluminum band and one colored Darvic band. For each individual, we determined age by plumage characteristics and sex by breeding-condition traits (presence of cloacal protuberance for males or brood patch for females). Birds not in breeding condition were recorded as unknown sex. We opportunistically banded birds at locations with high levels of bird activity, which included known nest locations to increase the number of females captured. We also banded nestlings when they were five to seven days old. We used all capture data for survival analyses.

Estimating annual apparent adult survival: statistical analyses

We used an open population Cormack-Jolly-Seber (CJS) model (Lebreton et al. 1992) in 'RMark' (Laake et al. 2013) in program R (version 3.1.3; R Core Team 2014) to compare apparent adult survival between species, sexes, and site type (unditched or ditched). These estimates are considered apparent survival, not true survival, because we could not distinguish between mortality and emigration from the study sites (Lebreton et al. 1992). We used goodness-of-fit tests in program RELEASE (Burnham et al. 1987) to confirm equal recapture probability and, during a given sampling period, equal probability of survival until the next sampling period among marked individuals (Amstrup et al. 2005). We first sought to determine if apparent adult survival differed between species. For this analysis, we

modeled survival as constant and assigned species, site type, and sex as individual and additive covariates to compare apparent adult survival between species. We modeled capture probability as constant, as well as species, year, site type, and sex as individual and additive covariates. We ran every combination of these survival and capture probability models, resulting in 65 survival models. Second, we wanted to determine what factors affected apparent adult survival for each species. For this analysis, we modeled survival as constant, with site type and sex as individual and additive covariates. We modeled capture probability as constant and assigned year, site type, and sex as individual and additive covariates. We ran every combination of these survival and capture probability models, resulting in 32 survival models for each species. Sparrows of unknown sex were excluded from the analysis (Seaside Sparrow $N=53$, 6.8%; Saltmarsh Sparrow $N=9$, 0.9%). For both analyses, we ranked models using Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC_c) and selected the top models where AIC_c values < 2 (Akaike 1974, Burnham and Anderson 2002). When there was no single top model, we used the model averaging function in package 'RMark' to generate model-averaged estimates.

Nesting success and failure probabilities: data collection

We located and monitored Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrow nests at each of the three study sites from mid-May through mid-August 2011 – 2015. We conducted systematic nest searches six days per week, visiting each site every two to four days such that every nest was checked within four days of the previous visit. On all visits, we recorded nest contents and assigned fates based on evidence at nest sites as fledged, failed due to flooding, failed due to predation, failed due to unknown cause, or unknown if fledged or failed. We considered a nest to have fledged young if it survived all previous visits, and was empty and well-worn when chicks were 10+ days old, the age at which they are able to leave the nest (Greenlaw and Rising 1994). We assigned a nest the fate of 'flooded' when a nest was observed underwater and found empty during the subsequent check, when intact eggs or uninjured dead chicks were found inside or outside of a nest following a high tide or heavy precipitation, or when a nest was found empty and wet immediately following a high tide or heavy precipitation. We assigned a nest the fate of 'predated' when a nest was empty and its structure or position in its substrate was disturbed, when obvious signs of predation remained at the nest site (e.g., injured dead nestlings, nestling body parts, or eggshells), or when a nest was found empty on a day that flooding could not have accounted for failure (no recent high tide or precipitation). When the cause of failure was unclear (e.g. abandonment, eggs were intact and there was no evidence of flooding) or in cases of conflicting evidence between nest flooding and predation, we assigned the fate of 'failed due to unknown cause.' Finally, we assigned the nest fate of 'unknown if failed or fledged' when a nest was found empty with no evidence of failure when chicks would have been 9 days old, an age at which they may be capable of fledging. Fully detailed criteria and protocols for nest-fate assignment are provided in Ruskin et al. (2017).

We measured five vegetation characteristics (vegetation height, percent cover high-marsh vegetation, percent cover low-marsh vegetation, nest visibility, and nest height) within a 1-m²-square quadrat centered at nests (Supplemental Method S1). Vegetation height and percent cover of high-marsh (*S. patens* and *Distichlis spicata*) and low-marsh (*S.*

alterniflora) vegetation were recorded within one week of nest completion to limit disturbance to nesting females. We estimated vegetation height by measuring the maximum vegetation height along each side of the quadrat and directly next to each nest, and averaging these five measurements for each nest. We visually estimated percent cover of high-marsh and low-marsh vegetation within the 1-m² frame. Percent cover of high-marsh and low-marsh vegetation was negatively correlated for Saltmarsh Sparrow nest sites (Kern 2015). Therefore, we used high-marsh as a covariate for Saltmarsh Sparrows and low-marsh as a covariate for Seaside Sparrows. Nest visibility and nest height were recorded upon discovery of active nests (with eggs and/or chicks) because these measurements could change as a nest aged due to disturbances or normal chick growth. Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrows weave canopies out of surrounding marsh grasses that cover their nests. We assessed nest visibility by visually estimating the percent obstruction of a paper disc (6.5-cm diameter) placed in the nest cup from directly above. Nest height was measured as the distance (cm) from the bottom of the nest bowl to the ground.

At each nest, we also recorded covariate measurements for each nest based on remotely collected data. Habitat edges can influence predator populations and avian nesting success rates are influenced by various habitat edge characteristics (Gates and Gysel 1978, Wilcove 1985, Donovan et al. 1997, Batary and Baldi 2004, Etterson et al. 2014). To estimate an edge effect, we created three edge covariates: distance to road, distance to forest, and distance to water. We digitized all roads, forests and water features within and surrounding the three study sites, including every ditch, stream, OMWM pond, and bordering canal using base maps in ArcGIS version 10.1 (ESRI, Redlands, USA 2010). We then used the 'Near' tool to separately calculate the distance of each nest to the nearest road, forest edge, and water feature. To incorporate tidal flooding into the nesting success models, we calculated the number of days between the previous new moon and nest initiation, following the procedures of Kern (2015). We assigned precipitation values to each nest based on the total precipitation that occurred during the days between the final two visits to each nest. We acquired precipitation data for the Atlantic City Marina weather station (www.njweather.org), the closest weather station to our study sites.

Nesting success and failure probabilities: statistical analyses

We used program-MCestimate (Etterson et al. 2007a, b) to analyze nesting success and failure probabilities due to depredation and flooding. MCestimate uses a Markov likelihood framework that estimates daily survival, as well as daily failure probabilities due to competing risks (Etterson et al. 2007a, b). To minimize bias, we censored our observations (visits and fate assignments) according to guidelines set by Stanley (2004), Etterson et al. (2007a), and Ruskin et al. (2016). After censoring the nest-monitoring data, we used 511 Seaside Sparrow nests (115 at the unditched site and 396 at ditched sites) and 314 Saltmarsh Sparrow nests (154 at the unditched site and 160 at ditched sites) for the subsequent analyses.

For the nest survival analysis, we had two primary objectives. First, we sought to determine the factors influencing Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrow nest survival and failure rates by estimating predation and flooding probabilities independently using a different set of

covariates and models for each cause of failure. Second, to determine if predation and flooding probabilities differed between species, we combined the Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrow datasets and included species as a covariate. If the species model did not have a AIC_c value < 2 , we concluded there was no evidence for a difference in nest survival or failure between species.

We used nine covariates (site type, nest height, mean vegetation height, nest visibility, distance to forest, distance to road, distance to water, year, and ordinal date) to estimate the factors that most influenced predation rates (Table 1). With no information about the true predator community at our sites, we could not predict the effect of site type on predation. We predicted that (1) nest height would be positively associated with predation rates because higher nests often have reduced cover and are more visible to predators (Pietz and Granfors 2000, Greenberg et al. 2006b), (2) vegetation height and nest visibility would have a negative relationship with predation rates (Martin and Li 1992, Colombelli-Negrel and Kleindorfer 2008), and (3) the distance of nests to forest, road, and water features would be negatively related to predation rates (Gates and Gysel 1978, Etterson et al. 2014). Finally, year and date were included because predation rates may have varied over time.

We included seven covariates (site type, nest height, percent coverage of low-marsh/high-marsh vegetation, days since new moon, precipitation, year, and date) that we predicted to have the greatest influence on flooding probability (Table 1). We predicted that (1) the unditched site would have a higher nest-flooding rate because ditched marshes drain more readily after flooding (Tonjes 2013), (2) flooding would be negatively related to date because sparrow nest initiation becomes more synchronized with tide cycles as the breeding season progresses (Shriver et al. 2007), (3) nest height would have a negative relationship with nest-flooding rates (Bayard and Elphick 2011), (4) percent cover of high-marsh is negatively related to flooding because this elevation zone in the marsh only floods during monthly high tides (Bertness 1999, Mitsch and Gosselink 2007), (5) low-marsh cover is positively related to flooding because areas containing this vegetation are flooded on a daily basis (Bertness 1999, Mitsch and Gosselink 2007), (6) because tide height was greatest during the new moon, flooding rates would be lower the sooner a nest was initiated after a new moon because this maximizes the nesting window before the next peak tide (Gjerdrum et al. 2005, Shriver et al. 2007), and (7) precipitation would be positively related to nest-flooding rates (Shriver et al. 2016). Finally, we included year as a random covariate because the magnitude and frequency of marsh surface flooding varies annually.

The model list for each cause of failure included a subset of models that we hypothesized to be the most biologically relevant (Table 2). For most variables, we included a univariate model to evaluate the effect of a single variable on nest failure probabilities. We also included additive models to specifically evaluate the additive effect of multiple covariates on these probabilities. The additive model ‘Distance to forest + distance to road + Distance to water’ was used to test for an effect of landscape features on nest predation probabilities. We included the model ‘Nest visibility + Mean veg height’ because the visibility of a nest to predators could be linked to both of these covariates. To evaluate the combined effect of annual and within-season variation of predation and flooding, we included the model ‘Year + Date’ for each cause of failure. For flooding models, we also included the model ‘Nest

height + High-marsh or Low-marsh' because the relative amount of these vegetation communities may influence flooding probabilities. We used the additive model 'Days since new moon + Date' to test for an effect of the tide cycle and time in season on flooding probability and the additive model 'Days since new moon + Precip' to test for a combined effect of the tide cycle and precipitation on flooding probability. We included the additive model 'Date + Precip' to determine if there was a within-season pattern of increased flooding probability and precipitation. Lastly, we included an interaction term of 'Site type * Nest height' to determine if the relationship between nest height and flooding depended on whether a site had grid-ditching, given that grid-ditching influences marsh flooding regimes. We also included a null and a global model for each model set. Models were ranked using AIC_c values and models with a AIC_c value < 2 were considered equivalent (Akaike 1974, Burnham and Anderson 2002). To evaluate the variation within each covariate, we calculated the daily success and failure probabilities for each category in the categorical covariates (i.e., each year) and the extremes (minimum and maximum) for each continuous variable in the top models for flooding and predation for each species.

RESULTS

Apparent adult survival

We banded 173 adult Seaside Sparrows at the unditched site and 547 at the ditched sites (720 total from 2011 to 2015, with 452 males and 268 females). We banded 467 adult Saltmarsh Sparrows at the unditched site and 562 adults at the two ditched sites (1029 total from 2011 to 2015, with 673 males and 356 females). Prior to conducting each survival analysis, we performed goodness-of-fit tests using program RELEASE (defined as Test 2 and Test 3 in the software; Burnham et al. 1987) to confirm that the data met the assumptions that every marked bird in the population had the same recapture probability (Test 2) and that every marked bird in the population at a given sampling period had the same survival probability until the next sampling period (Test 3; Amstrup et al. 2005). These goodness-of-fit tests did not indicate a lack of fit of the full CJS models to the data in the species-comparison analysis (Test 2: $\chi^2_{0.05, 16} = 7.3$, $P = 0.97$, Test 3: $\chi^2_{0.05, 32} = 19.1$, $P = 0.97$). Similarly, no violation of model assumptions was found for the within-species analysis for either Seaside Sparrows (Test 2: $\chi^2_{0.05, 8} = 2.9$, $P = 0.94$, Test 3: $\chi^2_{0.05, 16} = 3.8$, $P = 1.00$) or Saltmarsh Sparrows (Test 2: $\chi^2_{0.05, 8} = 4.4$, $P = 0.82$, Test 3: $\chi^2_{0.05, 16} = 15.2$, $P = 0.51$).

Annual apparent adult survival of Seaside Sparrows (61.6%, 95% CI: 52.5 – 70.0%) averaged 21.7% greater than that of Saltmarsh Sparrows (39.9%, 95% CI: 34.0 – 46.2%) based on model-averaged estimates (Table 3). For both species, the null model was among those with $AIC_c < 2$, indicating that sex and site type were weak predictors of apparent adult survival.

Nesting success and failure probabilities

We located and monitored 511 Seaside Sparrow nests (39% fledged young, 37% predated, 10% flooded, and 14% failed due to an unknown cause), providing an effective sample size of 4525 exposure days. We located and monitored 314 Saltmarsh Sparrow nests (39%

fledged young, 29% predated, 16% flooded, and 16% failed due to an unknown cause), providing an effective sample size of 2794 exposure days. Nest predation and flooding probabilities for nests of Seaside Sparrows were best predicted by year and date (Table 4). The probability of daily nest predation increased across the years of our study for Seaside Sparrows, and was approximately four times greater in 2015 than in 2011. The probability of nest predation for Seaside Sparrows declined throughout the breeding season (Table 5). The probability of flooding also declined throughout the breeding season (Table 5) and varied among years. The probability of nest predation for Saltmarsh Sparrows was best predicted by date (Table 6) and decreased throughout the breeding season (Table 7), whereas the probability of nest flooding was best predicted by year and date (Table 6). Flooding probability varied among years and decreased throughout the breeding season (Table 7). Finally, in the species-comparison analysis, the univariate species model was not among the top models, indicating no differences between Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrows in daily nest survival or predation and flooding probabilities.

DISCUSSION

With extensive ditching present throughout ~90% of the salt marshes along the Atlantic Coast of the United States (Bourn and Cottam 1950, Correll et al. 2016), evaluating possible differences in wildlife vital rates between unditched and ditched marshes is critical. We found no differences between an unditched site and ditched sites in either apparent adult survival or daily nest survival for either Seaside or Saltmarsh sparrows. Although mixed conclusions have been reported about the suitability of ditched marshes as Seaside Sparrow nesting habitat (Post and Greenlaw 1975, Marshall and Reinert 1990), Post (1974) also found no difference in nesting success between unditched and ditched salt marshes for Seaside Sparrows. Similarly, Pepper and Shriver (2010) found no difference between the nest success rates of Seaside Sparrows on sites with extensive OMWM and sites with limited OMWM. Our results thus join a growing body of evidence that ditched salt marshes are not lower-quality breeding sites for Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrows than unditched sites. Ditch plugging has increased in recent decades in an attempt to either restore historic saltmarsh hydrology or create open water habitat for fish or waterbirds in ditched marshes (Vincent et al. 2013). However, with no difference in nest survival between unditched and ditched sites, habitat management for Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrows apparently does not require ditch plugging. In fact, ditch plugging might actually reduce habitat quality for these species by increasing marsh surface flooding and contributing to overall nesting habitat loss (Goodman et al. 2007, Vincent et al. 2013).

Our estimated annual apparent adult survival rates suggest that the Seaside Sparrow annual apparent adult survival was >1.5 times greater than that of Saltmarsh Sparrows. The magnitude of this difference is apparent when considered over the expected lifespan of these species (Greenlaw and Rising 1994, Post and Greenlaw 1994). With an annual apparent survival rate of 61.6%, Seaside Sparrows that survive year one have a 23.4% chance of surviving to year four, whereas Saltmarsh Sparrows, with an annual apparent survival rate of 39.9%, have only a 6.4% chance of reaching year four. This difference may partially explain recent regional population trend estimates that indicate stable Seaside Sparrow populations, but populations of Saltmarsh Sparrows declining at an average of 9% per year (Correll et al.

2016). There is little evidence of adult mortality on the breeding grounds for either species, suggesting that differences in mortality occur away from the breeding grounds (Borowske 2015). Identifying the factors that explain why apparent adult survival rates vary by this magnitude should be a research priority. One possibility is that our methods did not permit estimation of ‘true’ survival, and the lower apparent survival of Saltmarsh Sparrows may have been due to higher rates of emigration from our study sites compared to Seaside Sparrows. However, we do not know of any reason why emigration rates would differ between species.

Recent estimates of adult survival rates of Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrows have been reported for breeding (DiQuinzio et al. 2001, Borowske 2015, Field 2016) and wintering (Winder et al. 2012, Borowske 2015) populations. Winder et al. (2012) estimated wintering survival for both species in North Carolina and found no significant difference between species, with an estimate of 48% (± 0.07 SE) for Seaside Sparrows and 52% (± 0.12 SE) for Saltmarsh Sparrows. Borowske (2015) also found no evidence of a difference in within-season apparent adult survival of Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrows in either breeding (Connecticut) or wintering areas (South Carolina). In contrast, our survival estimates indicate a significant difference in apparent annual survival of Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrows. Our estimate of Saltmarsh Sparrow apparent survival (39.9%, 95% CI: 34.0 – 46.2%) is similar to those reported by Field (2016), with range-wide mean survival rates for Saltmarsh Sparrows of 0.44 for females (95% credible interval = 0.37 – 0.52) and 0.49 (0.42 – 0.56) for males.

Despite differences in our apparent adult survival rates between species, our results suggest that use of similar management strategies for breeding Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrows may be beneficial. Three lines of evidence support this conclusion. First, we found that mean daily nest survival, predation, and flooding rates of Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrows did not differ. Second, for both species, the best predictors of nest predation and flooding rates were temporal covariates. The additive model of year and date was the top model for predation and flooding probabilities for Seaside Sparrows, and flooding probabilities for Saltmarsh Sparrows. Annual variation in flooding probabilities are largely explained by the annual variation in the timing of new moon tides in relation to the start of the breeding season and annual differences in precipitation (Kern et al. 2012, Shriver et al. 2016). The only difference between the two species in the top models was that date was the sole predictor of predation probability for Saltmarsh Sparrows. Both species also exhibited the same decreasing trend in predation and flooding rates during the breeding season. Nest predation rates in relation to date have not previously been reported for saltmarsh breeding birds, but predation rates have been found to both increase (Grant et al. 2005) and decrease (Burhans et al. 2002) throughout the breeding season in grasslands. A decline in predation rate during the breeding season may indicate either a temporal change in predator population dynamics or some adjustment in the nesting behavior of individual birds throughout the season (Thompson 2007).

The decline in probability of flooding during the breeding season was expected because tide height generally decreased throughout the breeding season (NOAA/National Ocean Service 2016) and tidal marsh sparrows synchronize nest initiation with spring tides after nest

failures early in the season (Shriver et al. 2007). The absence of any effect of the timing of nest initiation in relation to the lunar cycle on flooding probabilities for Saltmarsh Sparrows was surprising given the importance of this variable for this species in New England (Gjerdrum et al. 2005, Shriver et al. 2007).

Finally, for both species, we detected a greater probability of nest failure due to predation than to flooding, indicating that nest predation may be limiting population growth. In the northern hemisphere, where tidal ranges are correlated with latitude, these results support the latitudinal relationship between competing causes of nest failure, with flooding greatest at higher latitudes and predation increasing in the south (Greenberg et al. 2006b, Reinert 2006, Ruskin 2015). At the northern extent of the ranges of both species in New England, most nest failures are due to flooding (Marshall and Reinert 1990, DiQuinzio et al. 2002, Shriver et al. 2007, Bayard and Elphick 2011, Ruskin 2015). Farther south on Long Island, New York, Post and Greenlaw (1982) reported similar rates of nest failure due to predation and flooding. In Florida, Post et al. (1983) found that predation accounted for 89% of nest failures for a non-migratory subspecies of Seaside Sparrows.

Field (2016) examined sparrow vital rates across the northeastern United States and found that population trends for Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrows may be driven by fecundity. Despite regional differences in the prominent cause of nest failure, flooding and predation are threats to sparrow fecundity across the range of both species. In addition to habitat loss, sea-level rise threatens coastal wetland ecosystem function, including sparrow nest flooding regimes, by altering and the magnitude and frequency of marsh surface inundation (Morris et al. 2002, Craft et al. 2009). To combat these threats, marsh elevation can be maintained through thin-layer sediment deposition (Ford et al. 1999, Schrifft et al. 2008) and shoreline erosion and loss can be ameliorated through the implementation of living shorelines (Scyphers et al. 2011, Toh et al. 2017). Given that predation is the primary cause of nest failure in this critical breeding location, studies are needed to help develop management actions to mitigate the effect of predators on sparrow populations. We found variation in predation rates within and between breeding seasons, but the identity of dominant nest predators and the relative abundance of different nest predators remain to be determined. Video surveillance of nests would help identify predator species and their relative importance to sparrows (Stake et al. 2004, Bolton et al. 2007, Thompson 2007) and reduce uncertainty concerning reasons for nest failure (Etterson and Stanley 2008).

If nest predators can be identified, land managers could target predator populations in salt marshes and potentially increase sparrow reproductive output. Previously, only two studies, using small-scale, individual nest exclosures, have tested methods for reducing nest predation in Seaside Sparrow populations (Post and Greenlaw 1989, Boulton and Lockwood 2010) and no predator control research has specifically been conducted for Saltmarsh Sparrow populations. Given the irreversible threat to salt marsh breeding birds posed by rising sea levels, it is critical that potential solutions to more plausibly managed threats, such as predation, be considered. Predator-control programs have been used for bird conservation in a number of taxa (Smith et al. 2010, 2011, Lavers et al. 2010, Hartway and Mills 2012) with notable success in some systems, like island breeding birds (Vanderwerf and Smith

2002, Innes et al. 2010, Armstrong et al. 2014). Given the results of our study, these methods deserve further consideration as an option for conserving saltmarsh birds.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We thank the staff at Forsythe NWR for their assistance and support, particularly P. Castelli and V. Rettig. We also thank A. Anholt, N. Banet, D. Faith, M. Furst, M. Grasso, H. Kostick, K. Lewis, A. Mankofsky, N. Pearson, T. Pitcher, M. Rhode, and J. Warner for collecting data. Funding was provided by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (F14AC00166). This research was conducted with the following permits and permissions: University of Delaware Animal Care and Use Committee (AUP 1157) and Federal Bird Banding Permit 23475.

LITERATURE CITED

- Adamowicz, SC., Roman, CT. Initial ecosystem response of salt marshes to ditch plugging and pool creation: experiments at Rachel Carson National Wildlife Refuge (Maine). USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Coastal Research Field Station, University of Rhode Island; Narragansett, RI: 2002.
- Adamowicz SC, Roman CT. New England salt marsh pools: a quantitative analysis of geomorphic and geographic features. *Wetlands*. 2005; 25:279–288.
- Akaike H. A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*. 1974; 19:716–723.
- Akcakaya HR. Population viability analyses with demographically and spatially structured models. *Ecological Bulletins*. 2000; 48:23–38.
- Altieri AH, Bertness MD, Coverdale TC, Herrmann NC, Angelini C. A trophic cascade triggers collapse of a salt-marsh ecosystem with intensive recreational fishing. *Ecology*. 2012; 93:1402–1410. [PubMed: 22834380]
- Amstrup, SC., McDonald, TL., Manly, BFJ. *Handbook of capture-recapture analysis*. Princeton University Press; Princeton, NJ: 2005.
- Armstrong DP, Gorman N, Pike R, Kreigenhofer B, McArthur N, Govella S, Barrett P, Richard Y. Strategic rat control for restoring populations of native species in forest fragments. *Conservation Biology*. 2014; 28:713–723. [PubMed: 24617847]
- Batary P, Baldi A. Evidence of an edge effect on avian nest success. *Conservation Biology*. 2004; 18:389–400.
- Bayard TS, Elphick CS. Planning for sea-level rise: quantifying patterns of Saltmarsh Sparrow (*Ammodramus caudacutus*) nest flooding under current sealevel conditions. *Auk*. 2011; 128:393–403.
- Bender MA, Knutson TR, Tuleya RE, Sirutis JJ, Vecchi GA, Garner ST, Held IM. Modeled impact of anthropogenic warming on the frequency of intense Atlantic hurricanes. *Science*. 2010; 327:454–458. [PubMed: 20093471]
- Bertness MD. Zonation of *Spartina patens* and *Spartina alterniflora* in New England salt marsh. *Ecology*. 1991; 72:138–148.
- Bertness, MD. *The ecology of Atlantic shorelines*. Sinauer Associates; Sunderland, MA: 1999.
- BirdLife International [online]. [26 January 2016] *Ammodramus caudacutus*. The IUCN red list of threatened species 2012. 2012. <www.iucnredlist.org>
- BirdLife International [online]. [26 January 2016] *Ammodramus maritimus*. The IUCN red list of threatened species 2015. 2015. <www.iucnredlist.org>
- Bolton M, Butcher N, Sharpe F, Stevens D, Fisher G. Remote monitoring of nests using digital camera technology. *Journal of Field Ornithology*. 2007; 78:213–220.

- Borowske, AC. PhD dissertation. University of Connecticut; Storrs, CT: 2015. Effects of life history strategies on annual events and processes in the lives of tidal marsh sparrows.
- Boulton RL, Lockwood JL. Response of endangered Cape Sable Seaside Sparrows (*Ammodramus maritimus mirabilis*) to nest exclosures. *Florida Field Naturalist*. 2010; 38:8–11.
- Bourn, WS., Cottam, C. Some biological effects of ditching tidewater marshes. U.S. Department of Interior; Washington, D.C: 1950.
- Burhans DE, Dearborn D, Thompson FR, Faaborg J. Factors affecting predation at songbird nests in old fields. *Journal of Wildlife Management*. 2002; 66:240–249.
- Burnham, KP., Anderson, DR. Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical information-theoretic approach. 2. Springer; New York, NY: 2002.
- Burnham, KP., Anderson, DR., White, GC., Brownie, C., Pollock, KH. American Fisheries Society Monographs. Vol. 5. Bethesda, MD: 1987. Design and analysis of fish survival experiments based on release–recapture.
- Cahoon DR. A review of major storm impacts on coastal wetland elevations. *Estuaries and Coasts*. 2006; 29:889–898.
- Colombelli-Negrel D, Kleindorfer S. Nest height, nest concealment, and predator type predict nest predation in Superb Fairy-wrens (*Malurus cyaneus*). *Ecological Research*. 2008; 24:921–928.
- Correll MD, Wiest WA, Hodgman TP, Shriver WG, Elphick CS, McGill BJ, O'Brien KM, Olsen BJ. Predictors of specialist avifaunal decline in coastal marshes. *Conservation Biology*. 2017; 31:172–182. [PubMed: 27542096]
- Coverdale TC, Herrmann NC, Altieri AH, Bertness MD. Latent impacts: the role of historical human activity in coastal habitat loss. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*. 2013; 11:69–74.
- Craft C, Clough J, Ehman J, Joye S, Park R, Pennings S, Guo H, Machmuller M. Forecasting the effects of accelerated sea-level rise on tidal marsh ecosystem services. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*. 2009; 7:73–78.
- Daiber, FC. Conservation of tidal marshes. Van Nostrand Reinhold; New York, NY: 1986.
- Dale P, Hulsman K. A critical review of salt marsh management methods for mosquito control. *Reviews in Aquatic Sciences*. 1990; 3:281–311.
- Deegan LA, Johnson DS, Warren RS, Peterson BJ, Fleeger JW, Fagherazzi S, Wollheim WM. Coastal eutrophication as a driver of salt marsh loss. *Nature*. 2012; 490:388–392. [PubMed: 23075989]
- DiQuinzio DA, Paton PWC, Eddleman WR. Site fidelity, philopatry, and survival of promiscuous Saltmarsh Sharp-tailed Sparrows in Rhode Island. *Auk*. 2001; 118:888–899.
- DiQuinzio DA, Paton PWC, Eddleman WR. Nesting ecology of saltmarsh Sharp-tailed Sparrows in a tidally restricted salt marsh. *Wetlands*. 2002; 22:179–185.
- Donovan TM, Jones PW, Annand EM, Thompson FR. Variation in local-scale edge effects: mechanisms and landscape context. *Ecology*. 1997; 78:2064–2075.
- Elsner JB, Kossin JP, Jagger TH. The increasing intensity of the strongest tropical cyclones. *Nature*. 2008; 455:92–95. [PubMed: 18769438]
- Etterson MA, Greenberg R, Hollenhorst T. Landscape and regional context differentially affect nest parasitism and nest predation for Wood Thrush in central Virginia, USA. *Condor*. 2014; 116:205–214.
- Etterson MA, Nagy LR, Robinson TR. Partitioning risk among different causes of nest failure. *Auk*. 2007a; 124:432–443.
- Etterson MA, Olsen B, Greenberg R. The analysis of covariates in multi-fate Markov chain nest-failure models. *Studies in Avian Biology*. 2007b; 34:55–64.
- Etterson MA, Stanley TR. Incorporating classification uncertainty in competing-risks nest-failure analysis. *Auk*. 2008; 125:687–699.
- Field, CR. PhD dissertation. University of Connecticut; Storrs, CT: 2016. A threatened ecosystem in a human-dominated landscape: tidal marsh conservation in the face of sea-level rise.
- Ford MA, Cahoon DR, Lynch JC. Restoring marsh elevation in a rapidly subsiding salt marsh by thin-layer deposition of dredged material. *Ecological Engineering*. 1999; 12:189–205.

- Gaillard JM, Festa-Bianchet M, Yoccoz NG. Population dynamics of large herbivores: variable recruitment with constant adult survival. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*. 1998; 13:58–63. [PubMed: 21238201]
- Gates JE, Gysel LW. Avian nest dispersion and fledging success in field-forest ecotones. *Ecology*. 1978; 59:871–883.
- Gedan KB, Silliman BR, Bertness MD. Centuries of human-driven change in salt marsh ecosystems. *Annual Review of Marine Science*. 2009; 1:117–141.
- Gjerdrum C, Elphick CS, Rubega M. Nest site selection and nesting success in Saltmarsh breeding sparrows: the importance of nest habitat, timing, and study site differences. *Condor*. 2005; 107:849–862.
- Goodbred SL, Hine AC. Coastal storm deposition: salt-marsh response to a severe extratropical storm, March 1993, west-central Florida. *Geology*. 1995; 23:679–682.
- Goodman JE, Wood ME, Gehrels WR. A 17-yr record of sediment accretion in the salt marshes of Maine (USA). *Marine Geology*. 2007; 242:109–121.
- Grant TA, Shaffer TL, Madden EM, Pietz PJ. Time-specific variation in passerine nest survival: new insights into old questions. *Auk*. 2005; 122:661–672.
- Greenberg R, Maldonado JE, Droege S, McDonald MV. Tidal marshes: a global perspective on the evolution and conservation of their terrestrial vertebrates. *Bioscience*. 2006a; 56:675–685.
- Greenberg R, Elphick C, Nordby JC, Gjerdrum C, Spautz H, Shriver G, Schmelling B, Olsen B, Marra P, Nadav N, Winter M. Flooding and predation: trade-offs in the nesting ecology of tidal-marsh sparrows. *Studies in Avian Biology*. 2006b; 32:96–109.
- Greenlaw, JS., Rising, JD. Saltmarsh Sparrow (*Ammodramus caudacutus*). In: Poole, A., editor. *The Birds of North America Online*. Cornell Lab of Ornithology; Ithaca, NY: 1994.
- Hartway C, Mills LS. A meta-analysis of the effects of common management actions on the nest success of North American birds. *Conservation Biology*. 2012; 26:657–666. [PubMed: 22741927]
- Humphreys S, Elphick CS, Gjerdrum C, Rubega M. Testing the function of the domed nests of Saltmarsh Sharp-tailed Sparrows. *Journal of Field Ornithology*. 2007; 78:152–158.
- Innes J, Kelly D, Overton JM, Gillies C. Predation and other factors currently limiting New Zealand forest birds. *New Zealand Journal of Ecology*. 2010; 34:86–114.
- Kern, R. PhD dissertation. University of Delaware; Newark, DE: 2015. Conservation ecology of tidal marsh sparrows in New Jersey.
- Kern RA, Shriver WG, Bowman JL, Mitchell LR, Bounds DL. Seaside Sparrow reproductive success in relation to prescribed fire. *Journal of Wildlife Management*. 2012; 76:932–939.
- Knutson TR, Tuleya RE, Kurihara Y. Simulated increase of hurricane intensities in a CO₂-warmed climate. *Science*. 1998; 279:1018–1021. [PubMed: 9461431]
- Kopp RE, Kemp AC, Bittermann K, Horton BP, Donnelly JP, Gehrels WR, Hay CC, Mitrovica JX, Morrow ED, Rahmstorf S. Temperature-driven global sealevel variability in the Common Era. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*. 2016; 113:E1434–E1441.
- Laake JL, Johnson DS, Conn PB. marked: an R package for maximum likelihood and Markov Chain Monte Carlo analysis of capture–recapture data. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*. 2013; 4:885–890.
- Lavers JL, Wilcox C, Donlan CJ. Bird demographic responses to predator removal programs. *Biological Invasions*. 2010; 12:3839–3859.
- Lebreton JD, Burnham KP, Clobert J, Anderson DR. Modeling survival and testing biological hypotheses using marked animals: a unified approach with case studies. *Ecological Monographs*. 1992; 62:67–118.
- Marshall R, Reinert S. Breeding ecology of Seaside Sparrows in a Massachusetts salt marsh. *Wilson Bulletin*. 1990; 102:501–513.
- McCabe GJ, Clark MP, Serreze MC. Trends in Northern Hemisphere surface cyclone frequency and intensity. *Journal of Climate*. 2001; 14:2763–2768.
- Messier F. The significance of limiting and regulating factors on the demography of moose and white-tailed deer. *Journal of Animal Ecology*. 1991; 60:377–393.

- Michener WK, Blood ER, Bildstein KL, Brinson MM, Gardner LR. Climate change, hurricanes and tropical storms, and rising sea level in coastal wetlands. *Ecological Applications*. 1997; 7:770–801.
- Mitsch, WJ., Gosselink, JG. *Wetlands*. 4. Wiley; Hoboken, NJ: 2007.
- Morris JT, Sundareshwar PV, Nietch CT, Kjerfve B, Cahoon DR. Responses of Coastal Wetlands to Rising Sea Level. *Ecology*. 2002; 83:2869–2877.
- NOAA/National Ocean Service. Center for operational oceanographic products and services. 2016. [25 February 2016]
- Pepper MA, Shriver WG. Effects of open marsh water management on the reproductive success and nesting ecology of Seaside Sparrows in tidal marshes. *Waterbirds*. 2010; 33:381–388.
- Pietz PJ, Granfors DA. Identifying predators and fates of grassland passerine nests using miniature video cameras. *Journal of Wildlife Management*. 2000; 64:71–87.
- Post W. Functional analysis of space-related behavior in the Seaside Sparrow. *Ecology*. 1974; 55:564–575.
- Post W, Greenlaw JS. Seaside Sparrow displays: their function in social organization and habitat. *Auk*. 1975; 92:461–492.
- Post W, Greenlaw JS. Comparative costs of promiscuity and monogamy: a test of reproductive effort theory. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*. 1982; 10:101–107.
- Post W, Greenlaw JS. Metal barriers protect near-ground nests from predators. *Journal of Field Ornithology*. 1989; 60:102–103.
- Post, W., Greenlaw, JS., Merriam, TL., Wood, LA. Comparative ecology of northern and southern populations of the Seaside Sparrow. In: Quay, L.Funderburg, JB.Lee, DS.Potter, EF., Robbins, CS., editors. *The Seaside Sparrow, its biology and management*. Occasional Papers of the North Carolina Biological Survey; Raleigh, NC: 1983. p. 123-136.
- Post, W., Greenlaw, JS. Seaside Sparrow (*Ammodramus maritimus*). In: Poole, A., editor. *The Birds of North America Online*. Cornell Lab of Ornithology; Ithaca, NY: 1994.
- R Core Team. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. Foundation for Statistical Computing; Vienna, Austria: 2014.
- Reed JM, Mills LS, Dunning JB, Menges ES, McKelvey KS, Frye R, Beissinger SR, Anstett MC, Miller P. Emerging issues in population viability analysis. *Conservation Biology*. 2002; 16:7–19.
- Reinert SE. Avian nesting response to tidal-marsh flooding: literature review and a case for adaptation in the Red-winged Blackbird. *Studies in Avian Biology*. 2006:77–95.
- Rosenberg KV, Kennedy JA, Dettmers R, Ford RP, Reynolds D, Alexander JD, Beardmore CJ, Blancher PJ, Bogart RE, Butcher GS, Camfield AF, Couturier A, Demarest DW, Easton WE, Giocomo JJ, Keller RH, Mini AE, Panjabi AO, Pashley DN, Rich TD, Ruth JM, Stabins H, Stanton J, Will T. *Partners in Flight Landbird Conservation Plan: 2016 Revision for Canada and Continental United States*. Partners in Flight Science Committee. 2016
- Ruskin, KJ. PhD dissertation. University of Maine; Orono, ME: 2015. Intra- and interspecific variation in demographic rates and niche across the range of a species, the Saltmarsh Sparrow (*Ammodramus caudatus*).
- Ruskin KJ, Etterson MA, Hodgman TP, Borowske AC, Cohen JB, Elphick CS, Field CR, Kern RA, King E, Kocek AR, Kovach AI, O'Brien KM, Pau N, Shriver WG, Walsh J, Olsen BJ. Seasonal fecundity is not related to geographic position across a species' global range despite a central peak in abundance. *Oecologia*. 2017; 183:291. [PubMed: 27718065]
- Sather BE, Bakke O. Avian life history variation and contribution of demographic traits to the population growth rate. *Ecology*. 2000; 81:642–653.
- Sandcock BK, Jensen WE, Williams CK, Applegate RD. Demographic sensitivity of population change in Northern Bobwhite. *Journal of Wildlife Management*. 2008; 72:970–982.
- Scavia D, Field JC, Boesch DF, Buddemeier RW, Burkett V, Cayan DR, Fogarty M, Harwell MA, Howarth RW, Mason C, Reed DJ, Royer TC, Sallenger AH, Titus JG. Climate change impacts on U. S. coastal and marine ecosystems. *Estuaries*. 2002; 25:149–164.
- Schrift AM I, Mendelssohn A, Materne MD. Salt Marsh Restoration With Sediment-Slurry Amendments Following A Drought-Induced Large-Scale Disturbance. *Wetlands*. 2008; 28:1071–1085.

- Scyphers SB, Powers SP, KLH, Byron D. Oyster Reefs as Natural Breakwaters Mitigate Shoreline Loss and Facilitate Fisheries. PLOS ONE. 2011; 6:e22396. [PubMed: 21850223]
- Shriver WG, O'Brien KM, Ducey MJ, Hodgman TP. Population abundance and trends of Saltmarsh (*Ammodramus caudacutus*) and Nelson's (*A. nelsoni*) sparrows: influence of sea levels and precipitation. Journal of Ornithology. 2016; 157:189–200.
- Shriver WG, Vickery PD, Hodgman TP, Gibbs JP. Flood tides affect breeding ecology of two sympatric sharp-tailed sparrows. Auk. 2007; 124:552–560.
- Smith RK, Pullin AS, Stewart GB, Sutherland WJ. Effectiveness of predator removal for enhancing bird populations. Conservation Biology. 2010; 24:820–829. [PubMed: 20067492]
- Smith RK, Pullin AS, Stewart GB, Sutherland WJ. Is nest predator exclusion an effective strategy for enhancing bird populations? Biological Conservation. 2011; 144:1–10.
- Stake MM, Faaborg J, Thompson FR. Video identification of predators at Golden-cheeked Warbler nests. Journal of Field Ornithology. 2004; 75:337–344.
- Stanley TR. When should Mayfield model data be discarded? Wilson Bulletin. 2004; 116:267–269.
- Taylor RL, Walker BL, Naugle DE, Mills LS. Managing multiple vital rates to maximize Greater Sage-Grouse population growth. Journal of Wildlife Management. 2012; 76:336–347.
- Thompson FR. Factors affecting nest predation on forest songbirds in North America. Ibis. 2007; 149:98–109.
- Toh TC, Ng CSL, Loke HX, Taira D, Toh KB, Afiq-Rosli L, et al. A cost-effective approach to enhance scleractinian diversity on artificial shorelines. Ecological Engineering. 2017; 99:349–357.
- Tonjes DJ. Impacts from ditching salt marshes in the mid-Atlantic and northeastern United States. Environmental Reviews. 2013; 21:116–126.
- U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge comprehensive conservation plan. U.S. Department of Interior; Washington, D.C: 2004.
- Vanderwerf EA, Smith DG. Effects of alien rodent control on demography of the O'ahu 'Elepaio, an endangered Hawaiian forest bird. Pacific Conservation Biology. 2002; 8:73–81.
- Vincent RE, Burdick DM, Dionne M. Ditching and ditch-plugging in New England salt marshes: effects on hydrology, elevation, and soil characteristics. Estuaries and Coasts. 2013; 36:610–625.
- Warner, SE. MS thesis. University of Delaware; Newark, DE: 2009. Effects of direct and indirect habitat alterations on tidal marsh sparrows in Delaware Bay.
- Wiest WA, Correll MD, Olsen BJ, Elphick CS, Hodgman TP, Curson DR, Shriver WG. Population estimates for tidal marsh birds of high conservation concern in the northeastern USA from a design-based survey. Condor. 2016; 118:274–288.
- Wilcove DS. Nest predation in forest tracts and the decline of migratory songbirds. Ecology. 1985; 66:1211–1214.
- Winder VL, Michaelis AK, Emslie SD. Winter survivorship and site fidelity of Nelson's, Saltmarsh, and Seaside sparrows in North Carolina. Condor. 2012; 114:421–429.
- Wolfe RJ. Effects of open marsh water management on selected tidal marsh resources: A review. Journal of the American Mosquito Control Association. 1996; 12:701–712. [PubMed: 9046479]

Fig. 1. Study sites used from 2011 to 2015 at the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge, New Jersey (the green areas in the inset map indicate the extent of the refuge).

Table 1

Covariates used to model Seaside (SESP) and Saltmarsh (SALS) sparrow nest predation and flooding probabilities (abbreviations are provided in parentheses) from 2011 to 2015 at the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge, New Jersey.

Covariate	Fate used for	Description	SESP mean values	SALS mean values
Site type	Predation and Flooding	Unditched or grid-ditched study site	-	-
Year	Predation and Flooding	Year the nest was monitored	-	-
Date	Predation and Flooding	Day of the year (ordinal date) the nest was last visited	-	-
Mean vegetation height (Mean veg. height)	Predation	Mean height of vegetation within 1-m ² of nest	45.3 cm	34.3 cm
Nest visibility	Predation	Percent of the nest contents visible from above	31.6%	20.3%
Distance to forest	Predation	Distance of the nest to the closest forest	648.5 m	985.6 m
Distance to road	Predation	Distance of the nest to the closest road	820.0 m	1106.5 m
Distance to water	Predation	Distance of the nest to the closest water feature	10.3 m	19.6 m
Nest height	Predation and Flooding	Distance of the bottom of the nest to the ground	13.3 cm	7.4 cm
Low-marsh cover (Low-marsh)	Flooding (Seaside Sparrow only)	Percent coverage of low-marsh vegetation within 1-m ² of the nest	64.8%	-
High-marsh cover (High-marsh)	Flooding (Saltmarsh Sparrow only)	Percent coverage of high-marsh vegetation within 1-m ² of the nest	-	73.2%
Days since new moon	Flooding	Days since the most recent new moon that the nest was initiated	13.7 days	14.7 days
Precipitation (Precip)	Flooding	Total precipitation three days prior to the final visit to the nest	1.28 cm	1.10 cm

Table 2

Nest predation and flooding models used to analyze Seaside and Saltmarsh sparrow nest monitoring data collected from 2011 to 2015 at the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge, New Jersey (the global model is an additive model of all covariates).

Predation
Global
Null
Site type
Distance to forest
Distance to forest + Distance to road + Distance to water
Distance to road
Distance to water
Nest height
Nest visibility + Mean veg height
Date
Year
Year + Date
Species ¹
Flooding
Global
Null
Site type
Days since new moon
Days since new moon + Date
Nest height
Nest height + High-marsh (Saltmarsh Sparrow) or Low-marsh (Seaside Sparrow)
Precip
Precip + Days since new moon
Date
Date + Precip
Year
Year + Date
Site type * Nest height
Species ¹

¹ Only used for the species comparison analysis.

Table 3

Top five adult survival models (of 65) from the species survival comparison analysis based on mark-recapture sampling from 2011 to 2015 at the Edwin B. Forsythe NWR, New Jersey.

Model	AICc	Weight	Deviance	K
Phi(~Species)p(~Year + Site type + Species)	0.00	0.46	182.79	8
Phi(~Species)p(~Year + Site type + Sex + Species)	1.31	0.24	182.07	9
Phi(~Species)p(~Year + Sex + Species)	2.42	0.14	185.21	8
Phi(~Species)p(~Year + Site type)	4.19	0.06	189.00	7
Phi(~Species)p(~Year + Site type + Sex)	4.83	0.04	187.61	8

Table 4

The top five MCEstimate models for Seaside Sparrow predation and flooding probabilities from 2011 to 2015 at the Edwin B. Forsythe NWR, New Jersey.

Cause of failure	Model	AICc	Weight	K
Predation	Predated(Year + Date)Flooded(.)	0.00	0.71	7
	Predated(Site type + Year + Distance to forest + Distance to road + Distance to water + Date + Nest height + Percent visible + Mean veg. height)Flooded(.)	1.84	0.28	14
	Predated(Year)Flooded(.)	14.00	0.00	6
	Predated(Date)Flooded(.)	26.32	0.00	3
	Predated(Distance to road+ Distance to forest + Distance to water)Flooded(.)	33.79	0.00	5
Flooding	Predated(.)Flooded(Year + Date)	0.00	0.81	7
	Predated(.)Flooded(Year)	3.24	0.16	6
	Predated(.)Flooded(Site type + Year + Days since new moon + Precip + Date + Nest height + Low-marsh)	6.73	0.03	12
	Predated(.)Flooded(Date + Precip)	12.09	0.00	4
	Predated(.)Flooded(Date)	13.09	0.00	3

Table 5

Predicted Seaside Sparrow daily and nest period (25 days) success and cause-specific failure probabilities, based on covariates from the top MCEstimate models for each year (while holding date constant at the mean value) and the first and last day of the breeding season (while holding year constant at the intercept) from 2011 to 2015 at the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge, New Jersey.

Fate	Covariate	Parameter	Beta	SE	Daily success	SE	Daily failure	SE	Nest period success	SE	Nest period failure	SE
Predation	Year	Intercept (Year: 2011)	-1.035	0.810	0.969	0.005	0.016	0.005	0.460	0.065	0.283	0.080
		Year: 2012	0.420	0.457	0.961	0.007	0.024	0.007	0.374	0.071	0.393	0.090
		Year: 2013	0.894	0.427	0.948	0.010	0.038	0.010	0.259	0.066	0.540	0.087
		Year: 2014	1.192	0.361	0.935	0.006	0.051	0.006	0.186	0.031	0.638	0.042
		Year: 2015	1.408	0.352	0.924	0.006	0.063	0.006	0.138	0.021	0.706	0.032
	Date	Intercept	-1.035	0.810	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Date	-0.017	0.004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		first day of season (147)	-	-	0.884	0.014	0.103	0.014	0.045	0.018	0.846	0.033
		last day of season (219)	-	-	0.953	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.303	0.054	0.484	0.070
Flooding	Year	Intercept (Year: 2011)	-1.373	1.530	0.944	0.005	0.008	0.004	0.237	0.029	0.103	0.047
		Year: 2012	0.345	0.687	0.941	0.006	0.011	0.005	0.219	0.033	0.141	0.061
		Year: 2013	-0.111	0.843	0.945	0.005	0.007	0.005	0.241	0.034	0.093	0.059
		Year: 2014	-0.332	0.618	0.946	0.004	0.005	0.002	0.250	0.024	0.076	0.027
		Year: 2015	1.133	0.513	0.929	0.004	0.023	0.004	0.159	0.019	0.275	0.037
	Date	Intercept	-1.373	1.530	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Date	-0.019	0.009	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		first day of season (147)	-	-	0.911	0.011	0.042	0.012	0.098	0.030	0.427	0.080
		last day of season (219)	-	-	0.941	0.005	0.004	0.002	0.262	0.026	0.050	0.032

Table 6

The top five MCEstimate models for Saltmarsh Sparrow nest predation and flooding probabilities from 2011 to 2015 at the Edwin B. Forsythe NWR, New Jersey.

Cause of failure	Model	AICc	Weight	K
Predation	Predated(Date)Flooded(.)	0.00	0.54	3
	Predated(.)Flooded(.)	3.04	0.12	2
	Predated(Distance to forest)Flooded(.)	4.02	0.07	3
	Predated(Site type)Flooded(.)	4.07	0.07	3
	Predated(Distance to road)Flooded(.)	4.14	0.07	3
Flooding	Predated(.)Flooded(Year + Date)	0.00	0.74	7
	Predated(.)Flooded(Site type+ Year + Days since new moon + Precip+ Date + Nest height + High-marsh)	3.19	0.15	12
	Predated(.)Flooded(Days since new moon + Date)	4.66	0.07	4
	Predated(.)Flooded(Year)	6.62	0.03	6
	Predated(.)Flooded(Date)	9.03	0.01	3

Table 7

Predicted daily and nest period (25 days) success and cause-specific failure probabilities for Saltmarsh Sparrows based on covariates from the top MCestimate models for each year (while holding date constant at the mean value) and the first and last day of the breeding season (while holding year constant at the intercept) from 2011 to 2015 at the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge, New Jersey.

Fate	Covariate	Parameter	Beta	SE	Daily success	SE	Daily failure	SE	Nest period success	SE	Nest period failure	SE
Predation	Date	Intercept	-0.994	0.966	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Date	-0.012	0.005	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		first day of season (144)	-	-	0.917	0.012	0.062	0.012	0.116	0.039	0.660	0.066
		last day of season (231)	-	-	0.955	0.007	0.023	0.007	0.319	0.057	0.349	0.080
Flooding	Year	Intercept (Year: 2011)	-0.399	1.505	0.950	0.005	0.009	0.004	0.279	0.039	0.128	0.057
		Year: 2012	1.379	0.521	0.926	0.008	0.034	0.008	0.146	0.032	0.393	0.068
		Year: 2013	0.496	0.656	0.945	0.007	0.014	0.006	0.242	0.045	0.198	0.074
		Year: 2014	0.022	0.620	0.950	0.005	0.009	0.004	0.277	0.036	0.130	0.047
		Year: 2015	1.238	0.532	0.930	0.008	0.030	0.007	0.163	0.033	0.356	0.068
	Date	Intercept	-0.399	1.505	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Date	-0.023	0.008	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		first day of season (144)	-	-	0.938	0.015	0.022	0.011	0.202	0.061	0.278	0.116
		last day of season (231)	-	-	0.956	0.004	0.003	0.002	0.324	0.034	0.044	0.029