American Kestrel

Falco sparverius

Review Status: Peer-reviewed

Version Date: 15 December 2017

Conservation Status

NatureServe: Agency:

G Rank:G5ADF&G: Species of Greatest Conservation NeedIUCN: Least ConcernS Rank: S4BUSFWS:BLM:

Final Rank						
Conservation category: II. Red high status and either high biological vulnerability or high action need						
	Category	Range	<u>Score</u>			
	Status	-20 to 20	6			
	Biological	-50 to 50	-28			
	Action	-40 to 40	24			
Higher numerical scores denote greater concern						

Status - variables measure the trend in a taxon's population status or distribution. Higher status scores denote taxa with known declining trends. Status scores range from -20 (increasing) to 20 (decreasing). Score

	6
Long-term data (1993-2015) from the Breeding Bird Survey indicate a non-significant, but declining trend for interior Alaska (Handel and Sauer 2017). However, data are very limited. Evidence from elsewhere in its North American range indicate long-term declines (Smallwood et al. 2009; Sauer et al. 2017; Ely et al. 2018b).	
Distribution Trend in Alaska (-10 to 10)	0
Unknown.	
Status Total:	6
Biological - variables measure aspects of a taxon's distribution, abundance and life history. Higher biological scores suggest	
greater vulnerability to extirpation. Biological scores range from -50 (least vulnerable) to 50 (most vulnerable).	Score
greater vulnerability to extirpation. Biological scores range from -50 (least vulnerable) to 50 (most vulnerable). Population Size in Alaska (-10 to 10)	Score 0
greater vulnerability to extirpation. Biological scores range from -50 (least vulnerable) to 50 (most vulnerable). <i>Population Size in Alaska (-10 to 10)</i> PIF (2019) estimates a mean of 17,000 individuals, with very high uncertainty (95% CI: 2,600- 43,000). Because these estimates span 3+ ranking categories, we rank this question as Unknown.	Score 0
greater vulnerability to extirpation. Biological scores range from -50 (least vulnerable) to 50 (most vulnerable). <i>Population Size in Alaska (-10 to 10)</i> PIF (2019) estimates a mean of 17,000 individuals, with very high uncertainty (95% CI: 2,600- 43,000). Because these estimates span 3+ ranking categories, we rank this question as Unknown. <i>Range Size in Alaska (-10 to 10)</i>	Score 0 -10

calculated in GIS and based on range map from ACCS (2017a).

Class: Aves Order: Falconiformes

Audubon AK:Watch

Population Concentration in Alaska (-10 to 10)	-10
Does not aggregate (Smallwood and Bird 2002).	
Reproductive Potential in Alaska	
Age of First Reproduction (-5 to 5)	-5
Females breed within their first year (Smallwood and Bird 2002; Steenhof and Heath 2009).	
Number of Young (-5 to 5)	1
Mean clutch size is between 4 to 5 eggs (Smallwood and Bird 2002). Northern populations likely lay only one clutch per year (Smallwood and Bird 2002).	
Ecological Specialization in Alaska	
Dietary (-5 to 5)	-5
Feeds on a variety of prey items including aerial and terrestrial invertebrates, songbirds, and small mammals (Sherrod 1978; Collopy and Koplin 1989; Smallwood and Bird 2002; Johnson et al. 2008b). Diet appears flexible and likely reflects prey availability (Sherrod 1978; Smallwood and Bird 2002).	
<u>Habitat (-5 to 5)</u>	1
Inhabits a variety of open and semi-open habitats, including grasslands, marshes, agricultural fields, urban areas, and early successional forests (Smallwood and Bird 2002; Hutto and Gallo 2006; Johnson et al. 2008b). Obligate cavity nester. Nests in natural cavities, abandoned woodpecker cavities, buildings, and nest boxes (Smallwood and Bird 2002; Hutto and Gallo 2006).	
Biological Total:	-28

 Action - variables measure current state of knowledge or extent of conservation efforts directed toward a given taxon. Higher action scores denote greater information needs due of lack of knowledge or conservation action. Action scores range from -40 (lower needs) to 40 (greater needs).	Score
Management Plans and Regulations in Alaska (-10 to 10)	2
Protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA 1918). Individuals may be taken from the wild for falconry purposes (ADFG 2018a).	
Knowledge of Distribution and Habitat in Alaska (-10 to 10)	2
Distribution and broad habitat associations are known from multi-species surveys conducted throughout its range (Aumiller 1986; McIntyre and Ambrose 1999; Johnson et al. 2008b; Heinl and Piston 2009; MacIntosh 2009; Handel and Sauer 2017; Phillips et al. 2017). Habitat suitability models have been built (Marcot et al. 2015 Supplement). Additional research is required to determine specific habitat requirements, including nest site selection, and migratory and overwintering range.	
Knowledge of Population Trends in Alaska (-10 to 10)	10
This species is detected on Breeding Bird Survey routes (Handel and Sauer 2017); however, surveys only encompass a small part of its range and sample sizes are insufficient for determining short-term (10-year) trends or trends beyond major changes to the population. Given these important limitations, we rank this question as A- Not currently monitored.	10
Knowledge of Factors Limiting Populations in Alaska (-10 to 10)	10
Little information about factors influencing populations in Alaska or elsewhere in its range. Possible limiting factors include availability of nest or perching sites, prey availability (Dawson and	

Little information about factors influencing populations in Alaska or elsewhere in its range. Possible limiting factors include availability of nest or perching sites, prey availability (Dawson and Bortolotti 2000; Ely et al. 2018; Wiebe and Bortolotti 1995), human disturbance on breeding grounds (Strasser and Heath 2013; Touihri et al. 2019), environmental contaminants (Guigueno and

Fernie 2017; Whitney and Cristol 2017), and factors on migratory routes or overwintering grounds (e.g. habitat loss, mortality) (Smallwood and Bird 2002; Smallwood et al. 2009). Reasons for ongoing and widespread population declines remain speculative (Smallwood and Bird 2002; Smallwood et al. 2009; Ely et al. 2018b).

Action Total: 24

Supplemental Information - variables do not receive numerical scores. Instead, they are used to sort taxa to answer specific biological or management questions.

Harvest:	None or Prohibited
Seasonal Occurrence:	Breeding
Taxonomic Significance:	Monotypic species
% Global Range in Alaska:	<10%
% Global Population in Alaska:	<25%
Peripheral:	No

References

Alaska Center for Conservation Science (ACCS). 2017a. Wildlife Data Portal. University of Alaska Anchorage. Available online: <u>http://aknhp.uaa.alaska.edu/apps/wildlife</u>

Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG). 2018a. Alaska Falconry Manual No. 10. Division of Wildlife Conservation, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Juneau, AK, USA.

Aumiller, L. 1986. Birds seen at McNeil River, Alaska: 1976-1986. Unpublished document, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Juneau, AK, USA. Available online: http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/static/home/library/pdfs/wildlife/research_pdfs/potter_point_state_game_refuge_resource_inventory.pdf

Collopy, M. W., and J. R. Koplin. 1983. Diet, capture success, and mode of hunting by female American kestrels in winter. The Condor 85(3):369–371. DOI: 10.2307/1367081

Dawson, R. D., and G. R. Bortolotti. 2000. Reproductive success of American kestrels: The role of prey abundance and weather. The Condor 102(4):814–822. DOI: 10.1093/condor/102.4.814

Ely, T. E., C. W. Briggs, S. E. Hawks, G. S. Kaltenecker, D. L. Evans, F. J. Nicoletti, J.-F. Therrien, O. Allen, and J. P. DeLong. 2018b. Morphological changes in American kestrels (Falco sparverius) at continental migration sites. Global Ecology and Conservation 15:e00400. DOI: 10.1016/j.gecco.2018.e00400

Guigueno, M. F., and K. J. Fernie. 2017. Birds and flame retardants: A review of the toxic effects on birds of historical and novel flame retardants. Environmental Research 154:398–424. DOI: 10.1016/j.envres.2016.12.033

Handel, C. M. and Sauer, J. R. 2017. Combined analysis of roadside and off-road breeding bird survey data to assess population change in Alaska. The Condor 119(3):557-575. DOI: 10.1650/CONDOR-17-67.1

Heinl, S. C., and A. W. Piston. 2009. Birds of the Ketchikan area, Southeast Alaska. Western Birds 40(2):54-144.

Hutto, R. L., and S. M. Gallo. 2006. The effects of postfire salvage logging on cavity-nesting birds. The Condor 108(4):817–831. DOI: 10.1650/0010-5422(2006)108[817:TEOPSL]2.0.CO;2

Johnson, J. A., B. A. Andres, and J. A. Bissonette. 2008b. Birds of the major mainland rivers of Southeast Alaska. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-739. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR, USA.

MacIntosh, R., ed. 2009. Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge and the Kodiak Archipelago birds. Unpublished report, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge, Kodiak, AK, USA. Available online: <u>https://www.fws.gov/uploadedFiles/Region 7/NWRS/Zone 2/Kodiak/PDF/knwr bird broc 2009.pdf</u> Marcot, B. G., M. T. Jorgenson, J. P. Lawler, C. M. Handel, and A. R. DeGange. 2015. Projected changes in wildlife habitats in Arctic natural areas of northwest Alaska. Climate Change 130(2):145–154. DOI: 10.1007/s10584-015-1354-x

Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). 1918. U.S. Code Title 16 §§ 703-712 Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

McIntyre, C. L., and R. E. Ambrose. 1999. Raptor migration in autumn through the upper Tanana River Valley, Alaska. Western Birds 30:33-38.

Phillips, L. M., C. L. McIntyre, J. D. Mizel, E. J. Williams, and G. M. Colligan. 2017. Monitoring passerine birds in the Central Alaska Network. Report NPS/CAKN/NRRS—2017/1478, National Park Service, Fort Collins, CO, USA.

Partners in Flight (PIF). 2019. Population Estimates Database, version 3.0. Available online: http://pif.birdconservancy.org/PopEstimates. Accessed 09-April-2019.

Sauer, J. R., D. K. Niven, K. L. Pardieck, D. J. Ziolkowski, and W. A. Link. 2017. Expanding the North American Breeding Bird Survey analysis to include additional species and regions. Journal of Fish and Wildlife Management 8(1):154–172. DOI: 10.3996/102015-JFWM-109

Sherrod, S. K. 1978. Diets of North American Falconiformes. Raptor Research 12(3-4):49-121.

Smallwood, J. A. and D. M. Bird. 2002. American Kestrel (Falco sparverius), version 2.0. In The Birds of North America (P. G. Rodewald, editor). Cornell Lab of Ornithology, Ithaca, New York, USA. DOI:10.2173/bna.602

Smallwood, J. A., M. F. Causey, D. H. Mossop, J. R. Klucsarits, B. Robertson, S. Robertson, ..., and K. Boyd. 2009. Why are American Kestrel (Falco sparverius) populations declining in North America? Evidence from nest box programs. Journal of Raptor Research 43:274-282.

Steenhof, K., and J. A. Heath. 2009. American Kestrel reproduction: Evidence for the selection hypothesis and the role of dispersal. Ibis 151(3):493–501. DOI: 10.1111/j.1474-919X.2009.00930.x

Strasser, E. H., and J. A. Heath. 2013. Reproductive failure of a human-tolerant species, the American kestrel, is associated with stress and human disturbance. Journal of Applied Ecology 50(4):912–919. DOI: 10.1111/1365-2664.12103

Touihri, M., M. Séguy, L. Imbeau, M. J. Mazerolle, and D. M. Bird. 2019. Effects of agricultural lands on habitat selection and breeding success of American kestrels in a boreal context. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 272:146–154. DOI: 10.1016/j.agee.2018.11.017

Whitney, M. C., and D. A. Cristol. 2017. Impacts of sublethal mercury exposure on birds: A detailed review. Pages 113–163 in P. de Voogt, ed. Reviews of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology Volume 244. Springer International Publishing, Cham, CHE. DOI: 10.1007/398_2017_4

Wiebe, K. L., and G. R. Bortolotti. 1995. Egg size and clutch size in the reproductive investment of American kestrels. Journal of Zoology 237(2):285–301. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7998.1995.tb02763.x

Alaska Center for Conservation Science Alaska Natural Heritage Program University of Alaska Anchorage Anchorage, AK