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Abstract. That western and eastern songbird migration routes are distinct ecological systems has been proposed for over 100 years. Nonetheless, this distinction has not been widely recognized nor have there been any comparative studies that quantitatively evaluate the differences and similarities between western and eastern songbird migration systems. We drew from previously published research on wood warblers to highlight patterns in stopover ecology that suggest fundamental differences between western and eastern migrants. In particular, we compared biogeography, evolutionary relationships, and stopover ecology of wood warblers from western and eastern North America and found: (1) multiple lines of evidence that indicate western wood warblers are geographically isolated from eastern conspecifics or congeners throughout the annual cycle, (2) eastern and western wood warbler taxa are distinct evolutionary units, (3) migrant wood warblers captured in the Southwest tended to carry lower fat loads and be comprised of more after-hatch-year birds than is typical of eastern migrants, (4) frugivory is unknown in wood warblers endemic to the Northwest or Southwest and (5) relative to other regions and seasons, riparian vegetation is heavily used by western wood warblers in the spring. We think that further examination and synthesis of these differences would yield a more mechanistic understanding of Nearctic-Neotropical avian migration. On this basis, we elaborate our view that (1) an improved understanding of western songbird migration ought to be a high priority for science, conservation, and education, and (2) large-scale coordinated research efforts would be the most effective strategy for advancing our knowledge of passerine migration in the West.

Key words: biogeography, frugivory, migration, Parulidae, riparian, stopover ecology, wood warbler.

Una Comparación Este-Oeste de la Migración de las Reinitas de Bosque (Parulidae) de Norte América

Resumen. Por más de 100 años se ha propuesto que las rutas de migración de aves paseriformes del este y del oeste son sistemas ecológicos diferentes. Sin embargo, esta distinción no ha sido reconocida ampliamente, ni se han realizado estudios comparativos que evalúen cuantitativamente las diferencias y similitudes entre los sistemas de migración del este y del oeste. Revisamos estudios previamente publicados sobre aves de bosque de la familia Parulidae (Reinitas) para destacar los patrones ecológicos de las paradas migratorias que sugieren diferencias fundamentales entre las aves paseriformes migratorias el este y del oeste. Particularmente, comparamos la biogeografía, las relaciones evolutivas y la ecología de las paradas migratorias de las Reinitas del este y del oeste de Norteamérica y encontramos: (1) múltiples líneas de evidencia que indican que las Reinitas del oeste se encuentran geográficamente aisladas de sus coespecíficos o cogenéricos del este durante todo el ciclo anual, (2) los taxon del este y del oeste son unidades evolutivas independientes, (3) las Reinitas migratorias capturadas en el suroeste tendieron a presentar menores cargas de grasa y una mayor proporción de aves eclosionadas durante el año, que lo es típicamente observado para las aves migratorias del este, (4) la frugivoría no se conoce en las Reinitas endémicas del noroeste o sudoeste y (5) en relación a otras regiones o estaciones, la vegetación riparia es usada intensamente durante la primavera por las Reinitas del oeste. Creemos que estudios adicionales y una síntesis de estas diferencias podrían producir un mejor entendimiento mecanístico de la migración Neártico-Neotropical de aves. Basados en esto, sugerimos que (1) un mejor entendimiento de la migración de aves paserinas del oeste debería tener alta prioridad para la ciencia, conservación y educación y (2) que los esfuerzos
de investigación coordinados a gran escala serían la estrategia más efectiva para progresar en nuestro conocimiento sobre la migración de las aves paserinas en el oeste.

INTRODUCTION
Relative to its ecological importance and conservation relevance, the en route phase of the avian annual cycle is poorly known and in need of more research (Hutto 1998). Fortunately, the past two decades have begun to produce the enormous effort that is needed to diminish our ignorance regarding songbird migration in North America. Within the proceedings of the 1977 symposium on migrant birds in the Neotropics, there were no papers on en route migrants (Keast and Morton 1980). By 1989, there were a half-dozen papers in the nonbreeding section of a similar proceedings dedicated to en route migrants (Hagan and Johnston 1992). In the mid-nineties, Moore et al. (1995) published an influential review of the progress of research related to stopover ecology. Finally, in 2000, a volume dedicated entirely to en route migration was published (Moore 2000). Given this growing foundation, we should be in a good position to investigate the intricacies of avian migratory life histories and to apply that knowledge toward avian conservation.

Toward that end, we examined the literature on wood warblers of North America. We assumed that patterns emerging from studies of wood warblers (a single speciose group of North American origin) will serve to illustrate points that apply more broadly. First, we discuss wood warbler phylogeography as it relates to the distinct western migratory pathways proposed a century ago by Cooke (1904, 1915). Second, we examine selected literature on stopover ecology to further highlight some fundamental differences in both ecology and our level of knowledge regarding migration in eastern and western North America. Third, we argue that, in terms of benefits for science, education, and conservation, investment in a better understanding of landbird migration in western North America will yield great rewards. Finally, we propose that a large-scale, short-term collaborative research approach would rapidly advance our understanding of en route migration.

COMPARATIVE BIOGEOGRAPHY AND EVOLUTIONARY HISTORY
Western migration systems are geographically distinct from those in the East. A century ago, Cooke (1904, 1915) presented 7 major subdivisions in the migration pathways used by wood warblers in North America (Fig. 1). All are basically north-south routes, which may seem intuitive, but at least one recent example suggests that some species may deviate from this pattern (Ruegg and Smith 2002). Of Cooke’s proposed routes, 5 involve birds that breed in eastern North America and migrate over water to wintering areas in the Caribbean, Latin America, and South America. The remaining migration routes (No. 6 and 7, Fig. 1) involve primarily western species that migrate over land from the interior western U.S. and Canada to the Sierra Madre Oriental or eastern Mexico, and from the Pacific Coast to the Sierra Madre Occidental or Baja California.

Hutto (1985b) quantitatively characterized the breeding and wintering distributions of 50 wood warbler species based on the AOU (1957) checklist of North American Birds and showed that the geographic centers of the breeding ranges of wood warblers are clearly separated into 2 groups—an eastern and a western group (Fig. 2).
Moreover, plots of the centers of the winter distributions of the same species make it clear that eastern birds remain geographically isolated from western birds in winter as well as summer (Fig. 2).

Using recent range maps available in the Birds of North America species accounts (Poole and Gill, 1992–2003), we categorized 51 species’ distributions as being southeastern, boreal, northwestern, southwestern, or widespread (Fig. 3). Only 10 of 51 species were characterized as widespread, with the remaining 41 species being clearly endemic to one of four regions (Appendix). Both the boreal and southeastern regions contained 15 endemics while the southwestern and northwestern regions had relatively few endemic wood warblers (n = 7 and 4 species, respectively). This categorization also suggests distinct western and eastern migration systems for 41 of the 51 species. What about the 10 widespread species? Five of the species (Yellow Warbler [Dendroica petechia], Wilson’s Warbler [Wilsonia pusilla], Common Yellowthroat [Geothlypis trichas], Yellow-breasted Chat [Icteria virens], and Nashville Warbler [Vermivora ruficapilla]) show distinct western and eastern haplotypes using mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA; Milot 2000, Kimura 2000, Lovette et al. 2004). In addition, there have long been western and eastern subspecies (even species at times) described for Ovenbird (Seiurus aurocapillus), Orange-crowned Warbler (Vermivora celata), and Yellow-rumped Warbler (Dendroica coronata, Sogge et al. 1994, Van Horn and Donovan 1994, Hunt and Flaspoler 1998). Thus, of the 51 wood warbler species we examined, only the American Redstart (Setophaga ruticilla, Sherry and Holmes 1997) and the Black-and-white-Warbler (Mniotilta varia, Kricher 1995) have ranges that straddle the 100° meridian and do not have distinctly described subspecies; both are more abundant in the East. These biogeographic analyses are further corroborated by comparisons of capture rates of species at eastern and western migration sites, which suggest limited species overlap (Kelly et al. 1999). Cooke’s (1904, 1915) original migration map (Fig. 1), distinct winter geography revealed by Hutto (1985a), and this analysis are all consistent with the proposition that wood warblers use two divergent migratory systems within North America—one eastern and one western. By migration system, we mean a geographic region containing the breeding, migratory and wintering individuals of distinct demographic units.
Phylogenetic divergence between western and eastern wood warblers. Given that there are distinct eastern and western taxa of wood warblers (see above), what patterns of divergence exist among (1) eastern and western congeners or (2) eastern and western subspecies of more widely distributed species? Recent research in this area of comparative phylogeography has used mtDNA to determine the timing of speciation events with particular reference to the role of glaciation (Hewitt 2000), and interpretation of these data regarding the importance of Pleistocene speciation has been the subject of much debate (Zink and Slowinski 1995, Klicka and Zink 1997, Avise and Walker 1998). Uncertainty reflected by this debate limits our ability to determine which mechanisms are responsible for speciation events: it does not however entirely prevent us from speculating about the relative genetic distinctness of eastern and western wood warblers. We searched for studies that used mtDNA to propose either interspecific or intraspecific phylogenies of North American wood warblers. Not surprisingly, Dendroica warblers were among the best studied of all North American birds in this regard. Lovette and Bermingham (2000) produced a phylogeny based on mtDNA of 24 species of Dendroica. They found that the most recently derived clade within Dendroica comprised the Black-throated Green Warbler (Dendroica virens) complex and Grace’s Warbler (Dendroica graciae). Of these 5 species, 4 are western. Bermingham et al. (1992) have shown that the most recent speciation events within the Black-throated Green Warbler complex likely occurred in the West. Within Vermivora, Zink et al. (2000) found that the eastern subspecies of Nashville Warbler (V. ruﬁcapilla ruﬁcapilla) is ancestral not only to the western subspecies (V. ruﬁcapilla ridgwayi), but also to Lucy’s Warbler (Vermivora luciae) and Virginia’s Warbler (Vermivora virginiae), both of which are western species.

At the intraspecific level, both Klein and Brown (1994) and Milot et al. (2000) have found the greatest support for phylogenies in which Yellow Warblers from western populations are distinct from eastern ancestors. In the Common Yellowthroat mtDNA analyses indicate that western populations are relatively recently derived from eastern subspecies (Ball and Avise 1992). In the MacGillivray’s Warbler, Mila et al. (2000) found that western populations were likely the result of post-glacial range expansion of populations in northeastern Mexico. Finally, Kimura et al. (2000) used mtDNA to show that western populations of the Wilson’s Warbler were distinct from eastern populations.

Overall, of the 11 species we classified as having southwestern or northwestern breeding distributions, mtDNA-based phylogenies indicate that six species (four Dendroica, and two Vermivoras) have undergone relatively recent divergence that resulted in distinct eastern and western taxa (Lovette and Bermingham 1999, Zink et al. 2000). Three other species are restricted to the Southwest and are the sole representatives of their genus in the U.S. (Painted Redstart [Myoborus pictus], Olive Warbler [Peucedranus taeniatus], and Red-faced Warbler [Cardellina rubifrons]). We were also able to locate mtDNA-based phylogenies that surveyed the western and eastern populations for four of ten species that have widespread distributions. All of these phylogenies suggest distinct eastern and western taxa of Wilson’s Warbler, Yellow Warbler, Nashville Wabler, and Common Yelowthroats (Ball and Avise 1992, Zink et al. 2000, Milot 2000, Kimura 2000, Lovette et al. 2004). In summary, of the 21 wood warblers that occur in the West, we found mtDNA studies of 11 species. Ten of these studies reported that western taxa were divergent from eastern congeners or conspecifics; the exception was Mila et al. (2000; see above). The consistency of this finding suggests that wood warblers using western migration routes form distinct evolutionary units from those migrating through the East. It seems reasonable to expect that the selection pressure associated with migration in mountainous and arid landscapes have produced novel migratory behaviors and life histories.

Is the migratory connectivity strong or weak in the West? Webster et al. (2002) proposed the notion of connectivity for understanding the degree to which breeding individuals from a given demographic unit are shared by various winter locations and vice versa. For four species of widespread wood warblers, recent mtDNA data suggest that distinct haplotypes of western and eastern breeding wood warblers are closely associated with western and eastern wintering locations, respectively (Kimura et al. 2000, Lovette et al. 2004). In addition, there are indications that within western populations the latitude of the breeding range is associated with that of
FIGURE 4. The distribution of (A) sexes and (B) three migratory subspecies of Orange-crowned Warbler (*Vermivora celata*) in Mexico. This example illustrates a lack of clear sexual segregation and a lack of subspecifically based geographical isolation in winter. All collection localities are shown on each map. Filled circles represent localities where at least one specimen of the sex or subspecies shown was collected. Collection localities where no specimen of the sex or subspecies of interest was collected are represented by unfilled circles.

Based on these data, it seems likely that a given subspecies can be found most anywhere within the established winter range of its parent species. Similar results were reported by Ramos and Warner (1980) for a local study at Los Tuxtlas, Veracruz, Mexico. In these few cases, connectivity (sensu Webster et al. 2002) between any local breeding population (or geographic unit) and a particular winter location may be weak at the subspecific or population level. There would appear to be no small set of wintering locations for any particular breeding subspecies or population. In such cases, it may be unproductive to search for narrowly defined, geographically based Nearctic-Neotropic conservation partnerships. Whether these patterns are typical for western migrants in unknown. Only further efforts to quantify the seasonal links among geographic localities will allow generalizations to be made about the strength of connectivity among locales in the West. Regardless of the strength of connectivity we should be working to build meaningful international partnerships within a broad geographic framework based on species-wide distribution patterns.
Ramifications of unique geography: seasonal patterns in total area occupied and degree of sympatry. By plotting the breeding and wintering ranges of eastern and western warbler species (defined by the centers of each range as plotted in Fig. 2), it also becomes clear that, in the East, birds collectively occupy a small breeding area relative to the area occupied in winter. In addition, the average number of warbler species that a given eastern warbler species overlaps (to an extent greater than 50%) is greater in summer than in winter (Hutto 1995). That is, the different eastern warbler species actually spread out from one another a bit in winter relative to summer. Indeed, when MacArthur (1958) went to study his five warbler species in sympatry in Costa Rica winter, he could find only one (Black-throated Green Warbler). The same pattern is true for the Palaearctic-African migration system, and David Lack (1971), who was the first to suggest that coexistence might be promoted by separation of species in winter, noted that most European passerines were more isolated geographically in winter relative to summer. In contrast, in western North America, birds from a relatively large breeding area winter collectively in a relatively small wintering area (Fig. 5), and the average number of warbler species that a given western warbler species overlaps is greater in winter than in summer (Terborgh 1980, Cox 1985, Hutto 1995). This pattern appears to be unique among the few migration systems worldwide that have been well studied. The high degree of winter species overlap in the West is correlated with: (1) relatively high densities of wintering birds in many west-Mexican habitats, (2) broad habitat distributions of bird species that winter in western Mexico, and (3) diverse mixed-species flocks that occur in west-Mexican highlands in winter (Hutto 1980, 1986, 1987, 1995).

AN EAST VS. WEST COMPARISON OF EN ROUTE STOPOVER ECOLOGY

To this point, we have shown that, at least for wood warblers, the western migration system has geographic, ecological and evolutionary characteristics that make it unique. Consequently, we expect that the migration strategies used by birds in the West might differ from those in the East. As noted earlier, no New World migration system can be described as well studied (Cox 1985). Nonetheless, there are considerably more data available on the stopover ecology of eastern migrants than western migrants. Here, we use the few data that exist from the West to speculate on differences and similarities between stopover ecology in the East and West. The primary metrics we examined were fat scores, age ratios, degree of frugivory, and vegetation as-
Table 1. Means (or modes) of fat score distributions from selected studies of Nearctic-Neotropical migrants captured during fall stopover in the eastern U.S. Sexes were combined in all samples. We only report data for taxa in which >20 individuals were measured.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Stopover site</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Central tendency a</th>
<th>Source b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nashville Warbler</td>
<td>Lucky Peak, ID</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Carlisle et al. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange-crowned Warbler</td>
<td>Lucky Peak, ID</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Carlisle et al. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-throated Blue Warbler</td>
<td>Block Island, RI</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Parrish 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Redstart</td>
<td>Ft. Morgan, AL</td>
<td>AHY</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Woodrey and Moore 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ft. Morgan, AL</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Woodrey and Moore 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appledore Island, ME</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>0^-</td>
<td>Morris et al. 1994^d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Waterthrush</td>
<td>Appledore Island, ME</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1^-</td>
<td>Morris et al. 1994^d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block Island, RI</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Parrish 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovenbird</td>
<td>Appledore Island, ME</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2^-</td>
<td>Morris et al. 1994^d,e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia Warbler</td>
<td>Ft. Morgan, AL</td>
<td>AHY</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Woodrey and Moore 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ft. Morgan, AL</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Woodrey and Moore 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-rumped Warbler</td>
<td>Block Island, RI</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Parrish 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Warbler</td>
<td>Lucky Peak, ID</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Carlisle et al. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend’s Warbler</td>
<td>Lucky Peak, ID</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Carlisle et al. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacGillivray’s Warbler</td>
<td>Lucky Peak, ID</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Carlisle et al. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson’s Warbler</td>
<td>Middle Rio Grande, NM</td>
<td>AHY</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Wang et al. 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Rio Grande, NM</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Wang et al. 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucky Peak, ID</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Carlisle et al. 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Reported value is the mean unless otherwise noted.
b Fat was scored on the scale described by Helms and Drury (1960) unless otherwise noted.
c Reported value is the mode.
d Fat was scored on the scale described by Cherry (1982).
e Highest fat score reported was 2^+ and included scores 2 through 6.

Fat loads. We found data on mean or modal fat scores of 12 wood warblers from 6 authors (Table 1). Kerlinger and Moore (1987) reported fat scores combined across species. Most of these data were from widespread species (n = 7). Other species were boreal (2), northeastern (2), and southeastern (1). Notably, we found no fat score data on any of the species of southwestern warblers, and the only data from stopover sites in the southwestern region were from widespread species. In general, fat scores from the Gulf Coast region of the southeast were higher than those from elsewhere (Table 1). Given the high degree of interobserver variability in scoring fat levels (Kremnetz and Pendleton 1990), we wanted to avoid over interpretation. Consequently, we simply point out that the four highest mean fat scores in the East were from the Gulf Coast. In contrast, in the West the highest fat scores were not reported in the Southwest, but rather from the mountains of Idaho (Table 1). If these few data reflect a general pattern, then it may be that eastern birds carry the most fat in the extreme southern U.S. prior to crossing the Gulf of Mexico, whereas western birds carry the most fat when farthest from their winter destination (or in unpredictable montane environments).

Age ratios. We located age-ratio data for 29 species of wood warblers from stopover sites in the U.S. and Canada. There were data for 21, 22, 6, and 5 species captured in the boreal, southeast, southwest, and northwest regions, respectively. The strongest pattern that emerged from these data was the lack of after-hatch year (AHY) birds in northern and coastal regions. Perhaps due to a coastal effect (sensu Ralph 1971), there tended to be more AHY bird cap-
tured at sites in the West than in the East (Fig. 6). Most of the eastern data came from Apple-
dore Island (Morris et al. 1994) and Block Island (Parrish 1997) and Long Point Bird Observatory
(Dunn and Nol 1980, Jones et al. 2002), all of which catch very few AHY birds. In the West,
there were only a few data from Point Reyes and the Farallon Islands (Ralph 1971) where AHY
birds comprised less than 5% of migrants. This factor not withstanding, the highest percentages
of AHY wood warblers captured anywhere were reported in the interior southwest (Wang and Finch 2002). If this represents a general pattern,
it suggests either that older experienced birds
preferentially migrate through the Intermountain
West or that coastal populations are more pro-
ductive than intermountain populations. Either
of these scenarios would have a profound impact
on management plans for migratory wood war-
blers.

Frugivory. Levey and Stiles (1992) argued
persuasively that frugivory was a likely precur-
sor to migratory life histories in New World
birds. Because of evolutionary and ecological
implications, frugivory and omnivory have be-
come a focus of migration ecologists. Parrish
(1997, 2000) has shown that, among passerine
migrants, frugivory is a common attribute of
species that feed strictly on arthropods during
the breeding or winter residency phases of the
annual cycle. Morse (1971) suggested that die-
tary plasticity should be enhanced during migration as a hedge against uncertainty. Consistent
with this suggestion, Loria and Moore (1990)
showed that migrating Red-eyed Vireos (Vireo
olivaceus) increased both their behavioral and
micrcohbitat range in response to depleted ener-
geric status. Moore (1992) suggested a general
relationship between plasticity in foraging be-
havior and energetic condition of migrating
birds. To understand the relative importance of
frugivory, and perhaps dietary plasticity, for
eastern and western wood warblers, we re-ex-
mamed Parrish’s (2000) review of frugivory in
migrants to determine whether the incidence of
frugivory was equally distributed across biogeo-
graphic regions.

We found a striking difference in the reliance
on fruit between eastern and western wood war-
blers (Table 2). Diet data were available for 39
of 40 species of wood warblers that are boreal,
southeastern, or widespread in distribution. Of
these, there was evidence of frugivory in 37 spe-
cies (95%). Diet data were only available for
seven of the 11 species restricted to the South-
west or Northwest. There was no evidence of
frugivory in any of these seven species.

It is important to note that the level of effort
expended on documenting frugivory varies
widely among species. There can be little doubt
that more effort has been invested in diet studies
of boreal species than those in the Southwest,
which might explain some of the pattern we re-
port. Nevertheless, it is difficult to imagine that
frugivory is anywhere near as prevalent in wood
warblers in the West as it is in the East. Instead,
western wood warblers are much more reliant
on arthropod prey during migration than are
their eastern counterparts. An important question
for understanding migrant ecology would seem
to be whether western wood warblers could use
fruit, but choose not to because of its availabil-
ity, distribution, or palatability. Regardless, we
expect that this fundamental difference in fuel
sources used to power migration should be re-
lected in the timing, rate of passage, habitat
used, and fat loads during migration. Parrish
(1997, 2000) has shown that dietary flexibility
is a fundamental aspect of migration for eastern
species. Given that migrant wood warblers are
food limited, at times, in both the East (Moore
and Wang 1991) and the West (Kelly et al.
2002), what does the implied lack of dietary
TABLE 2. Number of wood warbler species for which frugivory has been reported in the literature during the nonbreeding season (overall), within migratory periods, and during winter periods, as reported by Parrish (2000). Degree of frugivory was scored as 0 = no records or <5% of samples in a quantitative study, + = 2 to 5 records of frugivory or 5% to 25% of samples, or ++ = more than 5 records or greater than 25% of samples. In situations where a given species was assigned more than one degree of frugivory, we used the highest reported value. Species were divided into regions based on geography of their breeding ranges (see Fig. 5). For species where Parrish (2000) reported no evidence of frugivory, we examined birds of North America (BNA) accounts (Poole and Gill, 1992–2003). We usually could not assign BNA reports of frugivory to a particular season.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th></th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th></th>
<th>BNA*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widespread</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of BNA accounts that mention plants as a diet item (total number of accounts examined in parentheses).

flexibility mean for western migrants? As with many other attributes of western migration, it would be instructive to conduct comparative field experiments to uncover the depth to which this dietary difference affects wood warbler life histories.

**Use of vegetation types.** A central question in management of migrant landbirds is what determines their distribution and abundance while en route (Petit 2000)? The prevailing hierarchical framework for understanding the habitat selection processes of en route migrants ascribes mechanisms to one of two categories: those processes intrinsic, or those extrinsic to a stopover location (Hilden 1965, Hutto 1985a, Moore et al. 1995). Among the intrinsic site processes, the role of micro- and macrohabitat use and selection has received the majority of attention (reviewed in Petit 2000).

We examined two studies of vegetation use by migrating wood warblers to search for differences between eastern and western species. In particular, we tried to evaluate the relative use of riparian habitats in these different regions. Both Parnell (1969) and Hutto (1985b) defined seven vegetation types within which they surveyed migrants. Parnell’s (1969) study took place in the spring in Raleigh, North Carolina. Hutto’s (1985a) research was done in spring and fall in the Chiricahua Mountains of southeast Arizona. We considered flood forest to be riparian vegetation in Parnell’s (1969) study and creek bottom to be riparian vegetation in Hutto’s (1985a). Combined, these studies report abundances of 32 species of wood warblers with 15 in Arizona and 19 in North Carolina. Only Yellow-rumped and Yellow Warblers were observed in both studies. When categorized by breeding distribution there were data on boreal (n = 7), southeastern (n = 4), southwestern (n = 6), northwestern (n = 4), and widespread (n = 10) species.

The highest percentage of wood warblers found in riparian vegetation overall was during spring migration in the West (Table 3). This pattern is not surprising since spring productivity of riparian vegetation in the arid West is considerably greater than that of surrounding uplands. As a result, in part, of monsoonal moisture, the difference in productivity between riparian and upland vegetation in the West is much less marked in late summer and autumn. The differing phenologies of productivity between riparian and upland habitats may contribute to loop migrations, which may be common within the West (Phillips 1975, Hutto 2000). That is, migrants use lowland riparian vegetation for migration during the spring when productivity and temperatures tend to be lower in the higher elevation habitats. In contrast, during the relatively warm dry conditions of fall, migrants may tend to favor migration through higher elevation forest vegetation types. This supposition seems particularly plausible for northwestern wood warblers that showed the largest seasonal shift in use of riparian vegetation between spring and fall (Table 3).

Other patterns in the use of riparian vegetation were that: (1) in the western migration system, wood warblers endemic to the Southwest...
used riparian vegetation heavily in both fall and spring migration seasons, with more than 40% of all observations recorded from this vegetation type. (2) In the eastern migration system, boreal endemics tended to use riparian vegetation more heavily than southeastern endemics, and (3) Riparian vegetation was used less heavily by widespread species than regional endemics in the West and East.

A number of authors have pointed out the heavy use of riparian habitats by migrants in spring relative to fall in the West (Hutto 1985a, Skagen et al. 1998, Kelly et al. 2000). It is also clear that the fraction of the western landscape that is comprised of riparian habitat is only about 1%, much smaller than in the East, and this small fraction of land has dwindled precipitously in the past two centuries (Knopf et al. 1988, Tellman et al. 1997, Patten 1998, Cartron et al. 2000, Periman and Kelly 2000, Tewksbury et al. 2002). What fraction of migrants depend on the meager portion the western landscape that remains riparian? A simple calculation suggests that if, as Table 3 suggests, 30% of wood warblers are in riparian vegetation and that vegetation comprises 1% of the landscape then the density of birds in this vegetation type must be 42 times greater than in the surrounding landscape: (% of migrants in riparian * % of landscape that is riparian vegetation\(^{-1}\)) * (% of migrants not in riparian vegetation * % of landscape that is not riparian vegetation\(^{-1}\))\(^{-1}\). We cannot say with certainty whether this is the case, nor can we say with certainty where the majority of migrants move through the western landscape, which underscores a major problem for developing conservation plans. However, two points are clear: riparian zones are a key to effective conservation of western migrants, and effective conservation will require better data on the spatial scales at which migrants assess and use western landscapes.

Summary. The combined data from phylogeography and stopover ecology suggest that the western migratory system might be unique worldwide in that it is largely an overland affair, comprised of species that are probably very restricted in the locations and habitats used during spring migration, and possibly during fall migration as well. If riparian corridors are used disproportionately frequently in spring, it would mean that an even tinier area than what is shown symbolically on a map might funnel most birds northward.

**BIRD MIGRATION: HIGH PRIORITY TOPIC FOR RESEARCH AND EDUCATION**

We think that research in avian migration is among those topics likely to produce truly integrated programs where science is coupled with education in a manner that produces effective conservation results. Future research in this discipline is compelled primarily by two factors inherent to avian migrants. First, the large area that migrant birds traverse within and among seasons makes them natural indicators of hemispheric and global-scale change. While birds and most other organisms can be subjects of local studies of reproduction and survival, only among long-distance migrants are individuals required to adapt to the vastly different regional and global contingencies of human resource consumption and resultant climate trajectories. Long-distance migrants traverse broad spatial scales, but they do so within a relatively short temporal period. This combination of broad spatial and short temporal ecology makes these species among the best natural biotic indicators of
present and future integrity of landscape and global processes. That these species rely heavily (many exclusively) on riparian habitats in western North America during the breeding and migratory phases of the annual cycle enhances the value of migrants as indicators of riparian condition as well. Consequently, better understanding of avian migratory biology has potential to reveal fingerprints of global change within time frames where management action can be effective. Second, because tracking these small organisms as they move between hemispheres is logistically challenging, avian migration biology continues to foster some of the most important technological innovations in field ecology. For example, advanced applications of satellite telemetry, population genetics, physiology, and biogeochemistry have all been encouraged through studies of the migration ecology of birds.

The scientific rationale for pursuing a better understanding of bird migration is strong, and it is matched by migration’s value for science education and conservation. The preponderance of private nongovernmental organizations whose primary focus is the conservation of birds is an indication of the political power that migratory birds wield. Finally, because the majority of riparian habitat in the West is in private ownership, effective conservation on those lands will require forward thinking changes to national and international land management policies that promote collaboration and cooperation between private landowners and the public agencies. For example, the Conservation Reserve Program has created millions of acres of grassland habitat for migratory birds on private lands. Such high-level policy decisions are made only when a broad constituency sees value in conservation, and threats to migratory birds are among the few environmental issues that have the strongest potential to influence such policy.

APPROACHES TO ADVANCING OUR UNDERSTANDING OF MIGRATION IN WESTERN NORTH AMERICA

We still do not know whether relatively few habitats are used by most landbird species during migration. Nonetheless, preliminary data suggest that lowland riparian vegetation constitutes the single-most important habitat in spring. A more definitive understanding of patterns of habitat use during migration are likely to emerge from a coordinated, collaborative research effort, where partners could collect occurrence data from a series of widely scattered sites within only a few years. From simple distributional information that also includes habitat information, we can inform land managers and conservation organizations about where and what habitat conditions we should be targeting for future restoration efforts. Specifically, if we understand the geographic locations and the specific ecological conditions used disproportionately by each species, we will have moved a long way toward their conservation. With emergence and success of coordinated regional monitoring programs, it strikes us that a coordinated research effort in the Southwest might be very productive.

One problem associated with funding a collaborative research effort is that funds available from most conservation and many governmental organizations are earmarked for restoration rather than research. This seems unwise given the fact that we do not even know which places or habitats give us the most return for our conservation effort. Nonetheless, resources have gone largely to on-the-ground restoration efforts in the absence of hard data to guide those efforts because: (1) research biologists have not done a good job educating others about the value of basic research, (2) a false dichotomy between research and monitoring is perpetuated by federal bureaucracy, which limits the effectiveness of both research and monitoring, and (3) research is often without the short-term focus needed to get meaningful results in a matter of years instead of a matter of decades. It is not impossible for a coordinated, collaborative research project to produce meaningful results in a matter of years, but short-term monitoring and swift information transfer must be a high priority and it must be funded as such.

A collaborative effort might be able to confirm whether or not the patterns we outlined above for warblers apply more broadly. If a series of research biologists were situated across the Southwest, for example, and if they conducted surveys at the same time of year in many habitats, they would be able to expose both migratory routes and habitats of importance in only a few years. Coupled with radar surveys and a series of tissue collection protocols across the same area, we could greatly further our knowledge of movement patterns within the West. The power of such a collaborative effort would come
from being able to attain an enviable level of true treatment replication across meaningful scales, and from the synergism associated with different kinds of research expertise working together.
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APPENDIX. Species names of wood warblers and region of endemism within North America.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Breeding region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olive Warbler (Peucedramus taeniayus)</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachman’s warbler (Vermivora bachmanii)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-winged Warbler (V. pinus)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden-winged Warbler (V. chrysoptera)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Warbler (V. peregrina)</td>
<td>Boreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange-crowned Warbler (V. celata)</td>
<td>Widespread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville Warbler (V. ruficapilla)</td>
<td>Widespread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia’s Warbler (V. virginiae)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colima Warbler (V. crisalis)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy’s Warbler (V. luciae)</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Parula (Parula americana)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Warbler (Dendroica petechia)</td>
<td>Widespread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut-sided Warbler (D. pensylvanica)</td>
<td>Boreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia Warbler (D. magnolia)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape-May Warbler (D. tigrina)</td>
<td>Boreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-throated Blue Warbler (D. caerulescens)</td>
<td>Boreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-rumped Warbler (D. coronata)</td>
<td>Widespread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-throated Gray Warbler (D. nigrescens)</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden-cheeked Warbler (D. chrysoparia)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-throated Green Warbler (D. virens)</td>
<td>Boreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend’s Warbler (D. townsendi)</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermit Warbler (D. occidentalis)</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-throated Warbler (D. dominica)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace’s Warbler (D. graciae)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Warbler (D. pinus)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirtland’s Warbler (D. kirtlandii)</td>
<td>Boreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Warbler (D. discolor)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Warbler (D. palmarum)</td>
<td>Boreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay-breasted Warbler (D. castanea)</td>
<td>Boreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackpoll Warbler (D. striata)</td>
<td>Boreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburnian Warbler (D. fusca)</td>
<td>Boreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerulean Warbler (D. cerulea)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-and-white Warbler (Mniotilta varia)</td>
<td>Widespread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Redstart (Setophaga ruticilla)</td>
<td>Widespread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prothonotary Warbler (Protonotaria citrea)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worm-eating Warbler (Helmitheros vermivorus)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swainson’s Warbler (Limnothlypis swainsonii)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovenbird (Seiurus aurocapillus)</td>
<td>Widespread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Waterthrush (S. noveboracensis)</td>
<td>Boreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Waterthrush (S. motacilla)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Warbler (Oporornis formosus)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Warbler (O. agilis)</td>
<td>Boreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mourning Warbler (O. philadelphia)</td>
<td>Boreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacGillivray’s Warbler (O. tolmiei)</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Yellowthroat (Geothlypis trichas)</td>
<td>Widespread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooded Warbler (Wilsonia citrina)</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson’s Warbler (W. pusilla)</td>
<td>Widespread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Warbler (W. canadensis)</td>
<td>Boreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-faced Warbler (Cardellina rubrifrons)</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted Redstart (Myioborus pictus)</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-breasted Chat (Icteria virens)</td>
<td>Widespread</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>