

AN EVALUATION OF HABITAT SELECTION AND AN ABUNDANCE ESTIMATE FOR
THE ENDANGERED KEY LARGO WOODRAT

by

CHRIS WINCHESTER

(Under the direction of Michael T. Mengak and Steven B. Castleberry)

ABSTRACT

The Key Largo woodrat (KLWR; *Neotoma floridana smalli*) is an endangered species endemic to the island of Key Largo. Despite protection of its remaining habitat from development, the population continued to decline over the last 20 years. Information on KLWR habitat preferences required to effectively manage the population is lacking, as is a means to monitor abundance. The objectives of this study were to examine habitat selection by KLWR at two spatial scales, the macro and micro-scales, and identify an efficient sampling design that can be used to monitor this rare population. Results of habitat and nest site selection suggest KLWR is limited by the availability of quality nest habitat and would benefit from the addition of artificial nest substrate and the continued protection of the forested uplands of Key Largo. Stratified random sampling was the most effective design and can be used to monitor the status of KLWR.

INDEX WORDS: Key Largo woodrat, *Neotoma floridana smalli*, macrohabitat selection, microhabitat selection, nest site selection, logistic regression, resource selection function (RSF), adaptive cluster sampling, radiotelemetry, abundance, closed population model, occupancy.

AN EVALUATION OF HABITAT SELECTION AND AN ABUNDANCE ESTIMATE FOR
THE ENDANGERED KEY LARGO WOODRAT

by

CHRIS WINCHESTER

B.A., University of Delaware, 1998

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2007

© 2007

Chris Winchester

All Rights Reserved

AN EVALUATION OF HABITAT SELECTION AND AN ABUNDANCE ESTIMATE FOR
THE ENDANGERED KEY LARGO WOODRAT

by

CHRIS WINCHESTER

Major Professor: Michael T. Mengak
Steven B. Castleberry

Committee: Michael J. Conroy
Nathan Nibbelink

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2007

DEDICATION

To my mom for her love and support.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I first want to acknowledge the members of my committee, Dr. Mengak, Dr. Castleberry, Dr. Nibbelink, and Dr. Conroy for their insight, advice, and constructive reviews of the thesis. I also would like to thank Dr. Jon Runge for his assistance with data analysis. Special thanks to my advisors, Dr. Mengak and Dr. Castleberry, for developing the project and providing me the opportunity to contribute to endangered species research and management.

Special thanks to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for project funding and technical support. Britta Muznieks, the USFWS Recovery Biologist, offered a great deal of help with project planning and data collection. Her assistance was central to the successful completion of the study and allowed for the capture of many more woodrats than we originally thought possible. Special thanks to Steve Klett, USFWS refuge manager, for providing field housing and equipment in Key Largo. Barry Wood, USFWS GIS Specialist, provided spatial data and maps that greatly facilitated data collection and analysis.

Finally, thanks to the technicians and volunteers who braved the mosquito forests of Key Largo to capture and radiotrack woodrats. James Beerens, Tilde Petersen, Maria Merrill, Emily Crosby, Shona Wilson, Mandi McElroy, Tracy Borneman, Dan Greene, Valerie Morgan all made substantial contributions to the project. Special thanks to Ralph, Clay and Jackie Degayner for volunteering their time and providing crucial insights into all things Key Largo.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xi
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW.....	1
SUMMARY.....	1
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
OBJECTIVES.....	11
LITERATURE CITED.....	11
2 AN EVALUATION OF FACTORS RESTRICTING THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE KEY LARGO WOODRAT.....	17
ABSTRACT.....	18
INTRODUCTION.....	19
STUDY AREA.....	21
METHODS.....	22
RESULTS.....	27
DISCUSSION.....	29
MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS.....	32
LITERATURE CITED.....	33

3	FORAGING MICROHABITAT AND NEST SITE SELECTION BY THE ENDANGERED KEY LARGO WOODRAT.....	46
	ABSTRACT.....	47
	INTRODUCTION.....	47
	STUDY AREA.....	51
	METHODS.....	53
	RESULTS.....	56
	DISCUSSION.....	58
	MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS.....	60
	LITERATURE CITED.....	61
4	KEY LARGO WOODRAT ABUNDANCE ESTIMATE USING EQUAL PROBABILITY AND ADAPTIVE SAMPLING.....	73
	ABSTRACT.....	74
	INTRODUCTION.....	74
	STUDY AREA.....	77
	METHODS.....	78
	RESULTS.....	82
	DISCUSSION.....	83
	MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS.....	86
	LITERATURE CITED.....	87
5	CONCLUSIONS AND MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS.....	97
	LITERATURE CITED.....	100

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 2.1: Variables measured at Key Largo woodrat trapping grids distributed throughout north Key Largo, Florida, 2005.....	39
Table 2.2: A priori models developed to examine factors restricting the distribution of the Key Largo woodrat in north Key Largo, Florida, USA, 2005. The general hypotheses used to develop each model are listed with covariates included in each model.....	40
Table 2.3: Summary of mean values and SE for habitat variables measured in association with used and unused grids by KLWR during 2005 in north Key Largo, Florida.....	41
Table 2.4: Variables, number of parameters in each model (K), Akaike's Information Criterion adjusted for small sample size (AIC_c), difference of AIC_c between a model and the model with the lowest AIC_c (ΔAIC_c), model weights (w_i), and Nagelkerke's R^2 values for models with $\Delta AIC_c \leq 4.0$ for 21 a priori models used to evaluate factors restricting the distribution of the Key Largo woodrat in north Key Largo, Florida, USA, 2005.....	42
Table 2.5: Model-averaged parameter estimates (β) and unconditional SE for habitat variables in models included in the confidence set ($\Delta AIC_c \leq 4.0$), selected from 21 a priori models on factors restricting the distribution of KLWR in Key Largo, Florida.....	43

Table 3.1: Habitat variables measured within a 12.5 m radius around KLWR foraging locations and random points within available foraging areas. Data were collected in north Key Largo, Florida, 2005-06.....	65
Table 3.2: Number of KLWR nests, utilizing natural and artificial substrate, in 4 hammock age classes (disturbed, young, medium, and mature) and number of debris piles available in each class. Data were collected on 39 radio-collared individuals between 2005 - 2006 on north Key Largo, Florida.....	66
Table 3.3: Model, number of parameters in the model (K), Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC), difference in AIC value between the model and the model with the lowest AIC value (Δ AIC), Akaike weights (w_i), Nagelkerke's R^2 , parameter estimates (β), SE, and 95% confidence intervals for 2 competing models on factors effecting nest selection by KLWR. DEBRIS and AGE were measured around nest sites (n = 66) and random locations (n = 66) throughout the study area in north Key Largo, Florida, 2005-2006.....	67
Table 3.4: Mean (\pm SE) of variables measured at KLWR foraging and available locations. Data were collected on 35 radiocollared individuals in north Key Largo, Florida, 2005-2006.....	68
Table 3.5: Variables, number of parameters in the model (K), Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC), difference in AIC value between the model and the model with the lowest AIC value (Δ AIC), Akaike weights (w_i), and Nagelkerke's R^2 for 22 a priori models used to predict relative probability of use of microhabitat by foraging KLWR. Data were collected on 35 radio-collared individuals in north Key Largo, Florida, 2005-2006.....	69

Table 3.6: Model averaged parameter estimates and unconditional SE's for microhabitat variables and interaction terms included in the top models ($\Delta AIC < 4$) from a candidate set of 22 a priori models of KLWR microhabitat selection.....70

Table 4.1: Eight closed population models from program MARK including the null model (M_0), models with a behavioral response (M_b), heterogeneity in capture probability (M_h), time effects (M_t), and models with all combinations of time, heterogeneity and behavior effects (M_{tb} , M_{th} , M_{bh} , and M_{tbh}), with number of parameters in each model (K), Akaike's Information Criterion adjusted for small sample size (AIC_c), difference of AIC_c between a model and the model with the lowest AIC_c (ΔAIC_c), model weights (w_i), and model deviance.....91

Table 4.2: Model-averaged estimates of mixture ($n=2$ groups; π_i), capture (p) and recapture probabilities (c), and abundance (N) from program MARK for 33 KLWR captured on 17 sampling units, 7 random and 10 adaptive, for 4 consecutive days April-May, 2005 on north Key Largo, Florida.....92

Table 4.3: Comparison of abundance estimates (N) and estimator variance for KLWR sampled April-June, 2005 in Key Largo, Florida from stratified random sampling as originally defined, with strata (K) misclassified, versus 3 designs using post-stratification with strata accurately delineated.....93

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 2.1: Map of study area delineating hardwood hammock from mangroves of north Key Largo, Florida, USA comprising the Crocodile Lake National Wildlife Refuge and Dagny Johnson Key Largo State Botanical Preserve and locations of 40 trapping grids used to estimate occupancy and evaluate factors restricting the distribution of the Key Largo woodrat in 2005.....	43
Figure 2.2: Sum of model weights (w_i) for 10 habitat variables included in 21 a priori models developed to evaluate factors restricting the distribution of the Key Largo woodrat in north Key Largo, Florida, USA, 2005.....	44
Figure 2.3: Mean model weights (w_i) for 21 a priori models developed under 3 general hypotheses on factors restricting the distribution of the Key Largo woodrat in north Key Largo, Florida, USA, 2005.....	45
Figure 3.1: Map of north Key Largo, Florida depicting study area (hardwood hammock), hammock age classes (new, medium old and disturbed/urban), and locations of random trapping grids and selectively trapped areas.....	71
Figure 3.2: Sum of model weights (w_i) for 5 habitat variables in 22 a priori models developed to examine microhabitat selection by KLWR in north Key Largo, Florida, 2005-2006.....	72

- Figure 4.1: Map of study area delineating hardwood hammock from mangroves of north Key Largo, Florida and locations of 40 trapping grids used to estimate abundance of the Key Largo woodrat, 2005.....94
- Figure 4.2: Example of adaptive cluster sampling (cross-hatched squares) around an initial random sample (black square) that met the pre-defined criteria of 1 unique individual, with the neighborhood for adaptive sampling defined as all immediately surrounding units that could support a 3 x 3 trapping grid with 25 m spacing. The resulting network consisted of 8 sampling units. The sampling unit on the bottom right corner was intersected by a road, which was considered a barrier to movement, and was not included as part of the network.....95
- Figure 4.3: Sample size (number of trapping grids) required to estimate abundance of KLWR within 20-80% of the actual value ($\alpha = 0.10$) using a stratified random design, with three strata delineated by density of debris piles and forest age class. Sample sizes were calculated based on strata-specific sample variances from post-stratification of data collected on 40 trapping grids on north Key Largo, Florida.....96

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

SUMMARY

The Key Largo woodrat (KLWR, *Neotoma floridana smalli*) is a federally endangered subspecies of the eastern woodrat (*Neotoma floridana*) endemic to Key Largo, Florida. KLWR historically ranged throughout the upland forests (hardwood hammocks) of Key Largo but is now restricted to federal and state managed lands on the northern one-third of the island (Barbour and Humphrey 1982). Despite protection of its remaining habitat from development, KLWR continued to decline since its listing in 1984 (McCleery et al. 2006b). The cause of the population decline is unknown, but the quality of existing habitat appears severely compromised. Past disturbances to the hardwood hammocks, such as farming and abandoned development projects, altered the structure and composition of the forested landscape. The degraded forest habitat may be further compromised by fragmentation and proximity to heavily urbanized areas. Fragmentation increased the amount of forest edge, which assisted in the establishment of red imported fire ants (*Solenopsis invicta*; Forsy et al. 2002). Fire ants are known to alter habitat use by small mammals (Smith et al. 1990, Killion and Grant 1993, Killion et al. 1995, Holtcamp et al. 1997) and may have reduced the quality of foraging habitat for KLWR. Urban areas offer year round food sources to predators, such as feral cats (*Felis catus*) and raccoons (*Procyon lotor*), potentially increasing their abundances (Hoffman and Gottschanng 1977, Prange et al. 2005) and KLWR predation levels.

Past KLWR studies focused on the differential use of forest patches at varying stages of recovery from disturbances, and were conducted at large spatial scales. Results were conflicting and shed little light on factors restricting KLWR (Hersh 1978, Barbour and Humphrey 1982, Keith and Gaines 2002, Sasso and Gaines 2002, McCleery et al. 2006b; Goodyear, unpublished report). In addition, little information is available on microhabitat selection by KLWR. Since animal populations are limited by factors that occur at multiple spatial scales, a multi-scale approach to observing habitat selection is often most informative (Hilden 1965, Johnson 1980). Given the uncertainty surrounding habitat requirements of KLWR and factors contributing to its decline, it is imperative that additional information on habitat selection be gathered to assess the quality of existing habitat and effectively guide recovery of the population

Nest sites are critical resources for KLWR, and are used as protective cover and refugia during inactive periods (McCleery et al. 2006b; Goodyear, unpublished report). Although KLWR are known to build and maintain stick nests (Goodyear, unpublished report), recent results suggest artificial nest substrate (i.e., rock and debris piles) is a preferred resource for nesting (McCleery et al. 2006b). In addition, recently disturbed areas characterized as young hammock were believed to be preferred nesting habitat (McCleery et al. 2006b). However, artificial substrate occurs frequently in recently disturbed areas, and may be confounded with young hammock. Distinguishing between young hammock and artificial nest substrate as preferred resources for nesting is critical since management recommendations differ greatly for each.

In addition to information on habitat selection, recovery of KLWR would benefit from a monitoring program to gauge the effectiveness of prescribed management. Monitoring the abundance of a rare species, like KLWR, is challenging using traditional sampling designs.

Equal probability designs, such as simple random sampling, often yield imprecise estimates even with large sample sizes. In addition to being rare, there is evidence KLWR may be clustered due to an association with artificial nest substrate (McCleery et al. 2006b). Adaptive cluster sampling (ACS) was developed as means to estimate the abundance of rare and clustered populations with greater precision (Thompson 1990). If successful, the increased efficiency of ACS would allow for a more cost-effective method to monitor KLWR and evaluate effectiveness of prescribed management.

The goals of this research were to examine a variety of factors potentially restricting KLWR, such as predator activity, structure and composition of vegetation, and availability of nest sites, by identifying macro and microhabitat selection. Nest site selection was evaluated to distinguish between the importance of artificial nest substrate and hammock age as nest habitat for KLWR. Collectively, results were used to recommend a management strategy to recover the population and reduce the risk of extinction. In addition, I compared the efficiency of adaptive cluster sampling to stratified random sampling in order to recommend an optimal design to monitor KLWR abundance and evaluate the effectiveness of recovery efforts.

LITERATURE REVIEW

KLWR Ecology and Habitat Use

The Key Largo woodrat (KLWR, *Neotoma floridana smalli*) is the southern-most subspecies of the eastern woodrat (*Neotoma floridana*) and is endemic to Key Largo, Florida. The insular population of KLWR is separated from its nearest conspecific by the southern one-third of the Florida peninsula (Hersh 1981). Although KLWR historically occurred throughout the upland forests of Key Largo, the remaining population is now restricted to the northern one-third of the island due to habitat loss (Barbour and Humphrey 1982). Previous attempts at evaluating

population status varied in methodology, but collectively demonstrated a consistent decline over the last 25 years (McCleery et al. 2006b). The population decline occurred despite the protection of its remaining habitat from development and its listing as an endangered species. Recent population estimates and a viability analysis suggest KLWR is at a high risk of extinction within the next ten years (McCleery et al. 2005, McCleery et al. 2006b).

Past research on KLWR habitat selection focused on differential use of forest patches, characterized by age class, in an effort to assess habitat quality and guide recovery of the population (Hersh 1978, Barbour and Humphrey 1982, Keith and Gaines 2002, Sasso and Gaines 2002, McCleery et al. 2006b; Goodyear, unpublished report). Unnatural disturbances, such as farming and land clearing, coupled with excavation for commercial development, created a mosaic of forest conditions throughout the landscape, varying in seral stage (Ross et al., unpublished report). It was hypothesized that the effect of these disturbances, and resulting heterogeneity in patch age, negatively impacted the persistence of KLWR. However, results were conflicting. Early efforts determined KLWR used mature or climax forest more frequently and were negatively impacted by the overall reduction of mature forest (Hersh 1981, Barbour and Humphrey 1982). In a later study, a difference in densities of KLWR was noted between northern and southern portions of Key Largo and was attributed to a preference for mature forests and areas far removed from residential development (Humphrey 1988). However, additional studies found KLWR to use a variety of forest types and did not determine a preference for any particular age class (Keith and Gaines 2002, Sasso and Gaines 2002; Goodyear, unpublished report). More recently, KLWR was found to prefer newly disturbed patches of forest and was absent from mature forest (McCleery et al. 2006b). The discrepancy in results from past research creates uncertainty as to the relevance and predictive ability of using

forest age class to identify habitat for KLWR. In order to better guide the recovery of KLWR and identify factors restricting the population, additional information on habitat selection extending beyond the use of different forest age classes is required.

Potential Restricting Factors

KLWR requires protective cover for suitable nest sites and quality foraging habitat within close proximity to the nest in order to minimize predation risk and optimally acquire resources (Orians and Pearson 1979). Due to their moderate size and terrestrial mode of life, *Neotoma* species are believed to be at a high risk to predation and rely heavily on nest sites and cover for protection (Rainey 1956). Changes in forest structure and composition could limit the quality of available nest sites and foraging habitat. Naturally occurring nest sites typically utilized by KLWR include the root systems of standing or wind-blown trees, logs, and solution holes (holes in the limestone substrate created by erosion; Goodyear, unpublished report). Recently, KLWR was found to use artificial substrate for nest sites, such as rock piles and debris from dumping activities, at a high frequency (McCleery et al. 2006b). Although it is common for *Neotoma* species to use anthropogenic structures for nesting, it is unclear if the observed pattern of nest use by KLWR was opportunistic or indicative of a decrease in the quality of naturally occurring nest substrate.

Housing developments, roads, and a waste transfer station, within and around the remaining hardwood hammock, resulted in fragmentation and an increase in anthropogenic food resources for raccoons (*Procyon lotor*) and feral cats (*Felis catus*), potentially increasing their densities (Hoffman and Gottschang 1977, Prange et al. 2005). Feral cats are well documented predators of small mammals (Baker et al. 2005, Espinosa-Gayosso and Alvarez-Castaneda 2006) and raccoons have been shown to depredate small mammals, including Norway rats (*Rattus*

norvegicus, Hoffman and Gottschang 1977). Increased predation levels due to unnaturally high predator densities could be contributing to KLWR population declines. The increase in forest edge resulting from fragmentation has facilitated the establishment of red imported fire ants (*Solenopsis invicta*), which favor disturbed areas lacking canopy cover (Forys et al. 2002). Past studies found small mammals altered patterns of habitat use to avoid fire ants (Smith et al. 1990, Killion and Grant 1993, Killion et al. 1995, Holtcamp et al. 1997). High fire ant abundance may have lowered the quality of foraging habitat for KLWR.

Habitat Selection and the Importance of Scale

Selection is the process by which an animal chooses a resource or habitat (Johnson 1980). The use of a habitat is considered selective if the habitat is exploited disproportionately to its availability (Johnson 1980). Animals select habitats at several spatial scales, and factors influencing selection vary across scales (Hilden 1965, Johnson 1980, Litviatis et al. 1994). In order to gain meaningful insights into habitat selection criteria, careful consideration must be given to scales chosen and factors likely affecting selection at those scales (Manly et al. 2002).

Habitat selection is commonly viewed at 2 spatial scales, the macro and micro-scales (Litviatis et al. 1994). Macro-scale studies examine landscape level processes, which limit the distribution of a population. An examination of micro-habitat selection typically focuses on selection of resources, such as food and cover, required for an individual to survive and reproduce. Considering the multi-scale effects experienced by animals, examining habitat selection at both the micro and macro-scales may offer the greatest insight to animal-habitat relationships (Morris 1984, Snyder and Best 1988).

Previous KLWR studies focused on habitat selection at the macro-scale. An examination of micro-scale habitat selection, selection of resources within the individual foraging range, may

provide valuable information on habitat preferences which are obscured at the macro-scale (Jorgensen and Demarais 1999, Castleberry et al. 2002). Sasso and Gaines (2006) evaluated KLWR microhabitat selection by comparing habitat around used and unused trap locations and suggested larger canopy trees and open understory were most important. However, traps may bias observed habitat selection due to imperfect detection and from luring animals into poor quality habitats. Radio-telemetry can be used to estimate habitat selection without the biases of trap response (Douglas 1989). McCleery et al. (2006a) used radio-telemetry to estimate selection of hammock age class by foraging individuals but measured availability at the scale of the study area and did not infer fine-scale selection. Microhabitat selection by KLWR has yet to be evaluated using radio-telemetry and could provide useful information on important habitat and resources.

Identifying habitat selection is critically dependent on accurate and biologically meaningful definitions of availability (Johnson 1980, McClean et al. 1998). Within areas defined as available to an individual, it is typically assumed that resources are equally available. The distribution of resources relative to the individual is not considered. For central place foragers, resources farther from the central place may be less available, as predation risk and energy expended increase with increasing distance from the central place (Orians and Pearson 1979). Due to increased predation risk at far distances, central-place foraging theory predicts individuals will be more selective of resources at greater distances from the central place (Schoener 1979). *Neotoma* species are nocturnal herbivores which exhibit central place foraging behavior (McGinley 1984). Woodrats typically maintain one or more nests that serve as daytime refugia and bases for nightly foraging bouts. Little information is available on KLWR foraging behavior, but individuals are known to maintain small home ranges,

and natural nest substrate. The abundance of artificial substrate (i.e., rock and debris piles) was the most important variable in predicting the occurrence of KLWR, followed by areas with larger overstory trees, of which the root systems are used as nest sites. In addition, KLWR selected areas with lower abundances of feral cats (*Felis catus*) and raccoons (*Procyon lotor*). The distribution of KLWR, therefore, appears restricted by a reduction in quality nesting habitat, which may be exacerbated by high mammalian predator abundance. Although a mammalian predator effect was supported by the data, manipulative studies are needed to better determine if predator reductions would effectively increase KLWR occupancy.

Observed nest use was consistent with macrohabitat selection results, where individuals mainly used the root systems of overstory trees and artificial substrate for nest sites. Artificial nest substrate was used more frequently, however, and KLWR was found to select nest sites based on the availability of artificial nest substrate. The high proportional use of artificial substrate suggests naturally occurring nest sites are in short supply, possibly due to past disturbances to the hammocks (i.e., farming and development). Due to the relatively short time since disturbance (70-80 years), current hammock conditions may not be fully representative of mature hammock, lacking trees large enough to provide adequate substrate for constructing natural nests. Additionally, artificial substrate likely offers greater protection from predators than natural substrate. Thus, high predator densities may be furthering the reliance on rock and debris piles for refugia. Although KLWR nested in younger hammock, the observed association appears to be confounded with the abundance of artificial substrate available in younger patches of hammock, as hammock age class alone was a poor predictor of nest site selection.

I found no evidence that KLWR selected foraging locations based on the structure or composition of vegetation. Consistent with central-place foraging theory (Schoener 1979), I

found that KLWR forage more frequently closer to the nest. The limited range of movements, and lack of habitat selection within the home range, suggests individuals may not be restricted by food resources or microhabitat, and can readily obtain necessary resources without incurring high risks associated with long distance movements.

ACS was less efficient than stratified random sampling as a method to estimate total population size. Delineating three strata based on the density of artificial substrate and hammock age using poststratification, effectively lowered estimator variance and produced the most precise estimate of total population size. Despite the reduction in estimator variance, gaining meaningful estimates of total population size with the optimal sampling design will be costly. Given that habitat improvement is likely to be conducted at smaller spatial scales, monitoring total population size may be unnecessary. Conducting habitat improvement under the framework of adaptive management, where the effects of prescribed management at treatment sites are measured against control sites, would provide feedback on the effectiveness of management in recovering the population without the costs of monitoring total population size.

Based on my results, KLWR would likely benefit from the continued protection of the hardwood hammocks which would promote the maturation of the hammock, increasing the availability of large overstory trees used as nest sites. However, immediate habitat improvement may require the addition of artificial nest substrate while the forest recovers from past disturbances. Given the evidence of a potential negative effect of high predator densities, experimental predator reductions, coupled with the addition of artificial nest substrate, may be the most effective means of improving habitat quality, while allowing for greater insight into the roles of each factor on limiting the KLWR population. Monitoring the effects of habitat

improvement at small spatial scales would likely be the most cost effective approach for evaluating the success of prescribed management.

LITERATURE CITED

- Barbour, D. B., and S. R. Humphrey. 1982. Status and habitat of the Key Largo woodrat and cotton mouse (*Neotoma floridana smalli* and *Peromyscus gossypinus allaptilicola*). *Journal of Mammalogy* 63:144-148.
- Goodyear, N. C. 1985. Results of a study of Key Largo woodrats and cotton mice: Phase I, spring and summer 1985. Unpublished report to North Key Largo Study Committee.
- Hersh, S. L. 1978. Ecology of the Key Largo woodrat. Thesis, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida, USA.
- Hilden, O. 1965. Habitat selection in birds: a review. *Annales Zoologici Fennici* 2:53-74.
- Johnson, D. H. 1980. The comparison of usage and availability measurements for evaluating resource preference. *Ecology* 61:65-71.
- Keith, B. W., and M. S. Gaines. 2002. Using geographic information systems to evaluate available habitat for two rodent species on north Key Largo. *Florida Scientist* 65:126-133.
- McCleery, R. A., R. R. Lopez, N. J. Silvy, P.A. Frank, and S. B. Klett. 2006. Population status and habitat selection of the endangered Key Largo woodrat. *American Midland Naturalist* 155:197-209.
- Sasso, C. R., and M. S. Gaines. 2002. Population ecology of three species of small mammals on Key Largo, Florida. *Florida Scientist* 65:115-125.
- Schoener, T. W. 1979. Generality of the size-distance relation in models of optimal feeding. *American Naturalist* 114:902-914.

Thompson, S. K. 1990. Adaptive cluster sampling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 85:1050-1059.