

of this study is to determine if cavity nesting birds using cavities present in the forest (secondary cavity-nesters) change their abundance and to understand the relationship between this group of species and cavity availability in piedmont Yungas forest being logged in northwestern Argentina. During two breeding seasons we conducted 30 point counts of 10 minutes length and 50 meter fixed-radius across three reference sites and three sites with forestry management in order to determine bird abundance. Additionally, we selected 10 to 20 circular plots to evaluate density of trees with cavities. We found higher abundance of secondary users in sites without forestry management compared to those being logged ($6,41 \pm 4,16$ vs. $3,36 \pm 2,73$; U Mann-Whitney = 22771 - $p = <0,0001$). Cavity density was also higher in sites without forestry management ($14,88 \pm 7,50$ vs. $6,20 \pm 4,05$; U Mann-Whitney = 1147,50 - $p = <0,0001$). Secondary user abundance was positively correlated with cavity density ($R^2 = 0,78$ - $p = 0,003$). The relationship between secondary users and cavity density suggests the need for maintaining these cavities available in sites with forestry management.

10675 BIRDS AND CAVITIES: KEY INTERACTIONS TO MANAGE LOGGED FORESTS

Vivanco, Constanza^{1,2}; Ruggera, Roman¹; Schaaf, Alejandro¹; Politi, Natalia¹; Rivera, Luis¹ ¹Instituto de Eco-Regiones Andinas (INECOA-CONICET) - Universidad Nacional de Jujuy
²contygvivanco@hotmail.com

Comparing interaction networks between cavity-nesting birds and trees, in undisturbed sites (US) and logged sites (LS), is useful for management guidelines of the latter. We present results of an ongoing monitoring of three US's and four LS's in piedmont forests of Salta and Jujuy. We recorded 229 interactions among 14 tree species and 20 bird species (five excavators, and 15 non-excavators) at US's, and 50 interactions between eight tree species and 14 bird species (four excavators and 10 non-excavators) at LS's. Non-excavators mostly used decay-formed cavities; woodpecker-excavated cavities were more often used at LS's (25% of non-excavator interactions, $n=24$) than at US's (10%, $n=68$). Key tree species based on Importance and Strength indices were *Calycophyllum multiflorum*, *Anadenanthera colubrina* and "snags" (dead trees) at US's, and snags, *A. colubrina* and *Astronium urundeuva* at LS's. Simulated extinction of key tree species disappeared 32% of bird species at US's, and 46% at LS's. There were three interaction modules at US's; a fourth module of non-excavating birds with decay-formed cavities in snags was added at LS's. Other parameters were similar in SSD vs. SAF: connectance 0.15 vs. 0.16; interaction dominance 0.135 vs. 0.140; and interaction evenness 0.957 vs. 0.962. The exposed differences suggest a shortage of decay-formed cavities in living trees at LS's, possibly due to the high extraction of *C. multiflorum*.

CONSERVATION

10239 CURRENT THREATS FACED BY NEOTROPICAL PARROT POPULATIONS

Berkunsky, Igor¹; Quillfeldt, Petra²; Brightsmith, Donald³; Masello, Juan²; Abbud, M. C.⁴; Aguilar, J.M.R.E.⁵; Alemán-Zelaya, U.⁶; Aramburú, R.M.⁷; Arce Arias A.⁸; Balas McNab,

R.⁹; Balsby, T.J.S.¹¹; Barredo Barberena, J.M.¹²; Beissinger, S.R.¹³; Benites de Franco MR¹⁴, Berg KS¹⁵, Bianchi CA¹⁶, Blanco E¹⁷, Bodrati A¹⁸, Bonilla-Ruz C¹⁹, Botero-Delgadillo E²⁰, Canavelli SB¹, Caparroz R⁶, Cepeda RE¹⁷, Chassot O⁷⁴, Cinta-Magallón C⁷, Cockle KL²¹, Daniele G²², de Araujo CB²³, de Barbosa AE²⁴, de Moura LN²⁵, Del Castillo H⁷³, Díaz S²⁷, Díaz-Luque JA²⁸, Douglas L⁹, Figueroa Rodríguez A²⁶, García-Anleu RA⁷², Gilardi JD²⁹, Grilli PG³⁰, Guix JC³¹, Hernández M³², Hernández-Muñoz A³³, Hiraldo F³⁴, Horstman E³⁵, Ibarra Portillo R³⁶, Isacch JP³⁷, Jiménez JE⁷, Joyner L³⁸, Juárez M³⁹, Kacoliris FP⁴⁰, Kanaan VT⁴¹, Klemann-Júnior L⁴², Latta SC⁴³, Lee ATK²², Lesterhuis A⁷, Lezama-López M¹, Lugarini C⁴⁴, Marateo G⁴⁵, Marinelli CB⁴⁶, Martínez J⁶, McReynolds MS⁴⁷, Mejia Urbina CR⁴⁸, Monge-Arias G⁴⁹, Monterrubio-Rico TC⁵⁰, Nunes AP⁵¹, Nunes FdP³², Olaciregui C⁷, Ortega-Arguelles J⁵², Pacifico E⁹, Pagano L⁵³, Politi N⁴⁴, Ponce-Santizo G⁵⁴, Portillo Reyes HO⁵⁵, Prestes NP⁵⁶, Presti F⁵⁷, Renton K⁵², Reyes-Macedo G⁷⁶, Ringler E⁵⁸, Rivera L⁵⁹, Rodríguez-Ferraro A⁶⁰, Rojas-Valverde AM⁶¹, Rojas-Llanos RE⁷⁵, Rubio-Rocha YG¹⁵, Saidenberg ABS⁶², Salinas-Melgoza A⁶³, Sanz V⁶⁴, Schaefer HM⁶⁵, Scherer-Neto P⁶¹, Seixas GHF⁴, Serafini P⁶⁵, Silveira LF⁶⁶, Sipinski EAB³², Somenzari M⁶⁷, Susanibar D¹, Tella JL⁶⁸, Torres-Sovero C⁶⁹, Trofino-Falasco, C⁷⁰, Vargas-Rodríguez R⁷¹, Vázquez-Reyes LD²⁴

¹Instituto Multidisciplinario sobre Ecosistemas y Desarrollo Sustentable, CONICET, Universidad Nacional del Centro de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, Tandil, Argentina ²Justus-Liebig-Universität Giessen, Department of Animal Ecology and Systematics, Giessen, Germany ³Texas A&M University, Schubot Exotic Bird Health Center, Department of Veterinary Pathobiology, College of Veterinary Medicine, USA ⁴Sociedade de Pesquisa em Vida Selvagem e Educação Ambiental, Brazil ⁵Universidade Federal de Sergipe, Brazil; ⁶Programa Lapa Verde, Centro Científico Tropical, Costa Rica; ⁷Facultad de Ciencias Naturales y Museo, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Argentina; ⁸Area de Conservación pacífico Central ACOPAC, Programa de Vida Silvestre, Costa Rica; ⁹Wildlife Conservation Society, Guatemala; ¹¹Grupo de Ecología y Conservación de Islas, A.C. (GECI), Mexico; ¹²University of California, Berkeley, Department of Environment Science, Policy & Management, Berkeley, USA; ¹³Universidad Nacional Federico Villarreal, Peru; ¹⁴Universidad Nacional Federico Villarreal, Peru; ¹⁵Universidade Federal de Goiás, Brazil; ¹⁶Instituto Venezolano de Investigaciones Científicas, Venezuela; ¹⁷Proyecto Selva de Pino Paraná, Argentina; ¹⁸Unidos por las Guacamayas A. C., Mexico; ¹⁹SELVA: Investigación para la conservación en el Neotrópico, Colombia; ²⁰Universidad de Brasilia, Brazil; ²¹Instituto Multidisciplinario sobre Ecosistemas y Desarrollo Sustentable, CONICET, Universidad Nacional del Centro de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, Tandil, Argentina; ²²Programa Lapa Verde, Centro Científico Tropical, Costa Rica; ²³Unidos por las Guacamayas A. C., ²⁴Instituto de Bio y Geociencias del NOA-CONICET, Argentina; ²⁵Facultad de Ciencias Naturales y Museo, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Argentina; ²⁶Unidad de Conservación de la Pariba, Centro de Ciências Exatas e da Natureza, Brazil; ²⁷Centro Nacional de Pesquisa e Conservação de Aves Silvestres/ICMBio, Brazil; ²⁸Universidade Federal do Pará, Instituto de Ciências Biológicas, Brazil; ²⁹Guyra Paraguaya, Paraguay; ³⁰University of Colorado, Department of Integrative Biology, USA; ³¹Fundación para la Investigación y Conservación de los Loros en Bolivia/Bolivian (CLB), Santa Cruz de la Sierra, Bolivia; ³²BirdsCaribbean; ³³Fundación del Rio, Nicaragua; ³⁴Wildlife Conservation Society, Guatemala; ³⁵The World Parrot Trust; ³⁶Cátedra de Ecología General y Recursos Naturales, Universidad Nacional Arturo Jauretche, Argentina; ³⁷Universitat de Barcelona, Spain; ³⁸Sociedad Conservacionista Audubon de Venezuela; ³⁹Universidad de Sancti Spiritus "José Martí Pérez", Cuba; ⁴⁰Estación Biológica de Doñana CSIC, Spain; ⁴¹Fundación Pro-Bosque, Ecuador; ⁴²Compañeros en Vuelo PIF-SV, El Salvador; ⁴³Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas y Costeras-CONICET - Universidad Nacional Mar del Plata, Argentina; ⁴⁴University of NorthTexas, Biological Sciences, USA; ⁴⁵Omora Ethnobotanical Park, Universidad de Magallanes, Puerto Williams, Chile; ⁴⁶One Earth Conservation, White Plains, NY, USA; ⁴⁷Facultad de Ciencias Naturales y Museo, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Argentina; ⁴⁸Instituto Espaço Silvestre, Brazil; ⁴⁹Universidade do Estado do Amazonas, Brazil; ⁵⁰National Aviary, Conservation and Field Research, Pittsburgh, PA, USA; ⁵¹University of Cape Town, South Africa; ⁵²BirdLife International; ⁵³Paso Pacífico, Nicaragua; ⁵⁴Centro Nacional de Pesquisa e Conservação de Aves Silvestres/ICMBio, Brazil; ⁵⁵Facultad de Ciencias Naturales y Museo, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Argentina; ⁵⁶Instituto Multidisciplinario sobre Ecosistemas y Desarrollo Sustentable, CONICET, Universidad Nacional del Centro de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, Tandil, Argentina; ⁵⁷Universidade de Passo Fundo, Brazil; ⁵⁸Biola University, USA; ⁵⁹Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales (MARENA), Nicaragua; ⁶⁰Programa Lapa Verde, Centro Científico Tropical, Costa Rica; ⁶¹Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolas de Hidalgo, Mexico; ⁶²Fundação Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso do Sul, Brazil; ⁶³AQUASIS, Brazil; ⁶⁴Fundación Botánica y Zoológica de Barranquilla, Colombia; ⁶⁵Provita, Venezuela; ⁶⁶Estación Biológica de Doñana CSIC, Spain; ⁶⁷Facultad de Ciencias Naturales y Museo, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Argentina; ⁶⁸CIT Jujuy – CONICET – UNJu, Argentina; ⁶⁹Wildlife Conservation Society, Guatemala; ⁷⁰INCEBIO, Fundación en Ciencias para el Estudio y Conservación de la Biodiversidad, Honduras; ⁷¹Universidad de Passo Fundo, Brazil; ⁷²UNESP, Instituto de Biociências de Botucatu, Brazil; ⁷³Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Estación Biología Chamela, Instituto de Biología, Mexico; ⁷⁴Vinculación Interdisciplinaria para el Desarrollo Ambiental y lo Social, Mexico; ⁷⁵Messerli Research Institute, University of Veterinary Medicine, Medical University of Vienna, and University of Vienna, Austria; ⁷⁶CIT Jujuy – CONICET – UNJu, Argentina; ⁷⁷Depto. de Estudios Ambientales, Universidad Simón Bolívar, Caracas, Venezuela; ⁷⁸Museo Noel Kempff Mercado, Bolivia; ⁷⁹Gobierno Autónomo Departamental de Santa Cruz, Bolivia; ⁸⁰Universidad Autónoma de Sinaloa, Mexico; ⁸¹Museo de Zoología da Universidade de Sao Paulo (MZUSP), Brazil; ⁸²Laboratorio Nacional de Análisis y Síntesis Ecológica, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico; ⁸³Instituto Venezolano de Investigaciones Científicas, Venezuela; ⁸⁴University of Freiburg, Evolutionary Biology and Animal Ecology, Austria; ⁸⁵Museu de História Natural Capão da Imbuia, Brazil; ⁸⁶Fundação Neotropical do Brasil, Brazil; ⁸⁷CEMARE, Centro Nacional de Pesquisa para a Conservação das Aves Silvestres, Brazil; ⁸⁸Museu de Zoologia da Universidade de Sao Paulo (MZUSP), Brazil; ⁸⁹Sociedade de Pesquisa em Vida Selvagem e Educação Ambiental, Brazil; ⁹⁰CEMARE, Centro Nacional de Pesquisa para a Conservação das Aves Silvestres, Brazil; ⁹¹CORBIDI, Peru; ⁹²Estación Biológica de Doñana CSIC, Spain; ⁹³Asociación Fauna Forever, Peru; ⁹⁴Instituto Multidisciplinario sobre Ecosistemas y Desarrollo Sustentable, CONICET, Universidad Nacional del Centro de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, Tandil, Argentina; ⁹⁵Universidad de La Serena, Chile; ⁹⁶Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Museo de Zoología, Facultad de Ciencias, Mexico; ⁹⁷U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Puerto Rican Parrot Recovery Program, Puerto Rico; ⁹⁸Echo, Bonaire; ⁹⁹Guyra Paraguaya, Paraguay. igorberkunsy@yahoo.com.ar

Psittaciformes (parrots, cockatoos) are among the most endangered birds, with 31% of Neotropical species under threat. The drivers of this situation appear to be manifold and mainly of anthropogenic origin. However, this assessment is based on the last extensive consultation about the conservation situation of parrots carried out in the 1990s. Given the rapid development of anthropogenic threats, updated data are needed to strategize conservation actions. Using a population approach, we addressed this need through a

wide-ranging consultation involving biologists, wildlife managers, government agencies and non-governmental conservation organizations. We gathered up-to-date information on threats affecting 192 populations of 96 Neotropical parrot species across 21 countries. Moreover, we investigated associations among current threats and population trends. Many populations were affected by multiple threats. Agriculture, capture for the pet trade, and logging each affected >55% of the populations, suggesting a higher degree of risk than previously thought. In contrast to previous studies at the species level, our study showed that the threat most closely associated with decreasing population trends is now capture for the domestic pet trade. Other threats associated with decreasing populations include small-holder farming, rural population pressure, nest destruction by poachers, agro-industry grazing, small-holder grazing, and capture for the international pet trade. Conservation actions have been implemented on <20% of populations. Our results highlight the importance of a population level approach in revealing the extent of threats to wild populations. It is critical to increase the scope of conservation actions to reduce the capture of wild parrots for pets.

10336 THE BIRD COMMUNITY OF BAÑADOS DE FIGUEROA, AN IMPORTANT AICA OF SANTIAGO DEL ESTERO, ARGENTINA

Echevarria, Ada Lilian^{1,2}; Martínez, María Valeria¹; Fanjul, María Elisa¹ ¹Instituto de Vertebrados - Ornitología, Fundación Miguel Lillo, Miguel Lillo 251, 4000, Tucumán, Argentina
²alechevarria@lillo.org.ar

In the vast plain formed along the Salado River, north of Argentina, there are the Bañados de Figueroa, a complex system of forests, grasslands, crops, natural and artificial wetlands. At present, this complex system has been modified by the influence of man, by modifying the natural limits of Bañado, with works of hydraulic engineering, which have altered the regime of the river and of the wetland as a whole. The aims of this work are to describe the diversity, the trophic assemblages and the variation of the bird community, in three artificial reservoirs that are part of the Bañado. Transects of long and fixed width were performed, from spring 2008 to winter 2012, with a total of 106 samples. We identified 154 species, with a total abundance of 164.051 individuals, of which 38.31% of species are migratory. The species were grouped into five assemblages according to feeding strategies and diets used by birds. The best represented assemblages were the ones that looked for the food moving between the vegetation (64 species) and those that look for the food walking in beaches and / or shallow waters (43 species); in addition, the omnivorous (53 species) and insectivorous-invertivorous species (49 species) were dominant. It is necessary to maintain the different wetlands of this system, which is considered an important area for bird conservation (AICA), to implement guidelines to regulate the hydrological regime to conserve the biological potential of the area.