

Article (refereed) - postprint

Ferrer, Miguel; Newton, Ian; Muriel, Roberto; Báguena, Gerardo; Bustamante, Javier; Martini, Matilde; Morandini, Virginia. 2014. **Using manipulation of density-dependent fecundity to recover an endangered species: the bearded vulture *Gypaetus barbatus* as an example.** *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 51 (5). 1255-1263. [10.1111/1365-2664.12308](https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12308)

© 2014 The Authors. *Journal of Applied Ecology* © 2014 British Ecological Society

This version available <http://nora.nerc.ac.uk/508504/>

NERC has developed NORA to enable users to access research outputs wholly or partially funded by NERC. Copyright and other rights for material on this site are retained by the rights owners. Users should read the terms and conditions of use of this material at <http://nora.nerc.ac.uk/policies.html#access>

This document is the author's final manuscript version of the journal article, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer review process. Some differences between this and the publisher's version remain. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from this article.

The definitive version is available at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com>

Contact CEH NORA team at
noraceh@ceh.ac.uk

1 **Using manipulation of density-dependent**
2 **fecundity to recover an endangered species: the**
3 **bearded vulture (*Gypaetus barbatus*) as an**
4 **example**

5
6 Miguel Ferrer¹, Ian Newton², Roberto Muriel¹, Gerardo Báguena³, Javier
7 Bustamante⁴, Matilde Martini¹, & Virginia Morandini¹

8
9 ¹Department of Ethology and Biodiversity Conservation, Estación Biológica
10 de Doñana (EBD-CSIC), C/ Americo Vespucio s/n, 41092 Seville, Spain.

11 ²Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, Benson Lane, Crowmarsh Gifford,
12 Wallingford, OX10 8BB. United Kingdom.

13 ³Fundación para la Conservación del Quebrantahuesos. Plaza San Pedro
14 Nolasco 1, 4ºF, 50001 Zaragoza, Spain.

15 ⁴Department of Wetland Ecology, Estación Biológica de Doñana (EBD-
16 CSIC), C/ Americo Vespucio s/n, 41092 Seville, Spain.

17
18 Corresponding author: Miguel Ferrer, Department of Ethology and
19 Biodiversity Conservation, Estación Biológica de Doñana (EBD-CSIC), C/
20 Americo Vespucio s/n, 41092 Seville, Spain. E-mail:
21 mferrer@ebd.csic.es Telephone: 0034-954466700 Fax: 0034-
22 954621125

- 1 **Running title:** Species recovery through fecundity manipulation
- 2 **Word count:** 6935 (including headings, title, authors and affiliations)
- 3 Summary: 330
- 4 Keywords: 14
- 5 Main text: 4435
- 6 References: 1619
- 7 Tables: 38
- 8 Figures: 278
- 9 **Number of tables:** 1
- 10 **Number of figures:** 7
- 11 **Number of references:** 67
- 12

1 **Summary**

2 **1.** Endangered species subjected to reintroduction programs often occur
3 as small and isolated populations with local high density and depressed
4 fecundity. Variation in territory quality may lead to this low fecundity
5 owing to increasing occupation of sub-optimal territories as population
6 density grows, known as the habitat heterogeneity hypothesis (HHH). In
7 this context, food supplementation in poor territories may be used to
8 produce extra young which could be allocated to reintroduction
9 programs.

10 **2.** We analyze the density-dependent fecundity pattern and the
11 underlying mechanism in a small population of bearded vultures
12 (*Gypaetus barbatus*) in Aragón (NE Spain). We then examine the
13 viability of a hypothetical reintroduction program using extra young
14 produced by supplementary feeding on poor territories and the effect on
15 the donor population by means of population simulations. We also
16 compare the economic cost of such a reintroduction program in relation
17 to the cost of a traditional captive breeding program.

18 **3.** The wild population showed clear negative density-dependent
19 fecundity regulation driven by the HHH mechanism, with territories
20 acting as a 'source-sink' system. Simulations showed that extractions
21 for translocations had no relevant long-term effects on the donor
22 population viability, but a marked population reduction during the
23 extraction period. However, the implementation of supplementary
24 feeding to produce extra young for translocation lessened significantly

1 this expected initial population reduction.

2 **4.** Likewise, analyses showed that the annual budget of a captive
3 breeding program for this species could be seven times more expensive
4 than the translocation of extra young produced by food
5 supplementation.

6 **5. *Synthesis and applications.*** Reintroduction programs are increasingly
7 used as effective conservation techniques. Released individuals may be
8 provided by captive breeding programs, which have often been
9 relatively expensive and entailed various problems, or by translocation
10 of wild-reared individuals, which may be subjected to public criticism
11 and potential effects on donor populations. In this respect, raising
12 fecundity by means of supplementary feeding in heterogeneous
13 populations was shown to be a relatively cheap source of young for
14 reintroductions, also avoiding negative effects on donor populations and
15 public opinion.

16

17 **Keywords:** cost analysis, habitat heterogeneity hypothesis, population
18 viability analysis, reintroduction, site-dependence hypothesis,
19 supplementary feeding, translocation

1 **Introduction**

2 The two main ways of obtaining a sustainable source of young to
3 undertake a reintroduction program are breeding in captivity and
4 extraction from wild populations. However, many endangered species,
5 persist as small relatively isolated populations but at high local density
6 (IUCN 2012). This is a common pattern in some large species, such as
7 raptors, that have suffered from human persecution and habitat
8 destruction in the past (Ferguson-Lees & Christie 2003). Species
9 showing this type of distribution are often subject to reintroduction
10 programs aimed at extending the current range and numbers of the
11 species and, consequently, their expected persistence time (IUCN 1998;
12 Seddon 2010). Remaining high-density populations of endangered
13 species often show low fecundity, resulting from density-dependent
14 processes (Nicholson 1933; Lack 1954; Sinclair 1989; Newton 1998).
15 This fact complicates one of the methods used in reintroduction
16 programs: the extraction of free-living young for release in other areas.
17 Because fecundity is low, public opinion is often against extractions,
18 making sensible management difficult, especially if extractions can put
19 the donor population at risk. On the other hand, using young from a
20 pre-existing captive population avoids any effects on potential wild
21 donor populations.

22 Density-dependent effects in the regulation of bird populations,
23 especially fecundity, are well described (Cooch *et al.* 1989; Newton
24 1994, 1998; Ferrer & Donazar 1996; Rodenhouse, Sherry & Holmes

1 1997; Penteriani, Gallardo & Roche 2002; Penteriani, Balbontín & Ferrer
2 2003; Kokko, Harris & Wanless 2004; Ferrer, Newton & Casado 2006,
3 2008). Two major mechanisms have been proposed (Fretwell & Lucas
4 1970). The first is called the habitat heterogeneity hypothesis (HHH)
5 (Dhondt, Kempenaers & Adriaensen 1992; Ferrer & Donazar 1996), or
6 site-dependence hypothesis (Rodenhouse, Sherry & Holmes 1997). In
7 such situations, at low population densities, individuals select optimal
8 territories. As density increases, an increasing proportion of individuals
9 are relegated to poorer territories, where breeding is less successful,
10 lowering the mean per capita fecundity of the population as a whole
11 (Andrewartha & Birch 1954; Brown 1969).. The second potential
12 mechanism is named the individual adjustment hypothesis (IAH) or
13 interference competition hypothesis. In this situation (Lack 1966,
14 Fretwell & Lucas 1970; Dhondt & Schillemans 1983), density-dependent
15 depression of fecundity is envisaged to affect all individuals of the
16 population to a similar extent. It can arise from a general depression in
17 food supplies, or an increased frequency of aggression and interference
18 among territorial pairs, resulting in a hostile social environment that leads
19 to a relatively uniform reduction in breeding performance across the
20 population. Under this hypothesis, as density rises, all or most individuals
21 (or territories) should show reduced fecundity (Fernandez, Azkona &
22 Donazar 1998).

23 According to both hypotheses, mean fecundity declines as density
24 rises (Ferrer & Donazar 1996). But from a conservation point of view, the

1 two mechanisms have different effects. In a high density population under
2 HHH, a fraction of the territories are producing most of the young,
3 contributing disproportionately to the recruitment and persistence of the
4 population ("sources" according to Ferrer & Donazar 1996). Under IAH,
5 however, the production of young is more uniformly distributed among
6 territories (Ferrer, Newton & Casado 2008). Under the heterogeneity
7 hypothesis, the destruction of a fraction of the population would have
8 tremendous effects on population viability if high quality territories were
9 affected or small effects if only poor territories were affected. Under IAH
10 the effect should be proportional to the fraction affected.

11 Variation in the quality of territories is the main driver of fecundity
12 according to the HHH. Differences in productivity among territories have
13 been explained by differences in food availability, degree of human
14 disturbance, mortality factors, and other differences (Newton &
15 Marquiss 1976; Newton 1991, Ferrer & Donazar 1996; Ferrer & Bisson
16 2003). Food availability seems to be both one of the most common
17 factors limiting territory quality and one of the easiest to manipulate.
18 Supplementary feeding is a common practice in raptors and other
19 species to raise reproductive output, either for experimental or
20 conservation purposes (e.g. California condor, Wilbur, Carrier &
21 Borneman 1974; sparrowhawk, Newton & Marquiss. 1981; various
22 vulture species, Terrasse 1985; common kestrel, Wiehn & Korpimaki
23 1997; Spanish imperial eagle, González *et al.* 2006, Ferrer & Penteriani
24 2007; bearded vulture, Margalida 2010). In a high density population,

1 food supplementation in 'sink' territories could lead to an
2 'overproduction' of young that are not strictly necessary to maintain the
3 population. Although these extra young could increase the resilience of
4 the original population, keeping surplus birds nearby in case of
5 population decline, the demographic values of these extra young would
6 be higher in a well-designed reintroduction programme in a new but
7 suitable area. This holds especially when the donor population operates
8 under the HHH, because in this situation the aim is to produce extra
9 young from territories that would otherwise be mostly unproductive.
10 Those extra young can then be used in reintroduction programs, for
11 example, releasing them in areas where they might not otherwise settle,
12 but without affecting the trend of the donor population. Under the IAH,
13 it is much less predictable whether or not donor territories would
14 produce young naturally in any particular year, so some supplementary
15 feeding could be ineffective, and the impacts of removal on the donor
16 population would be much less certain.

17 The only surviving bearded vulture (*Gypaetus barbatus*)
18 population in the Spanish Pyrenees is composed of 150 reproductive
19 units (mostly pairs, but some polyandrous trios), 78 of them in the
20 region of Aragon. In this Aragonese population, we analyzed fecundity
21 to find whether the observed density dependence was operating as
22 expected on HHH or IAH. This finding enabled us to evaluate the
23 potential for producing extra young using a supplementary feeding
24 program, and whether a reintroduction program could be undertaken

1 without affecting the viability of the donor population. Finally, the cost
2 of such a procedure was compared against a typical program of captive
3 breeding for release.

4

5 **Material and methods**

6 SPECIES AND POPULATION

7 The bearded vulture is a large long-lived territorial raptor, with delayed
8 maturity (adult plumage at 5–7 years old), that breeds in sparsely
9 distributed territories in mountainous regions (Donázar *et al.* 1993). Its
10 numbers and breeding range declined throughout Europe during much
11 of the twentieth century (Hiraldo, Delibes & Calderón 1979; Tucker &
12 Heath 1994; Mingozi & Estève 1997; Grubac 2002). The clutch
13 generally consists of two eggs, but only one chick survives due to
14 obligate cainism (Brown 1977; Thaler & Pechlaner 1980; Heredia &
15 Heredia 1991). The species feeds mainly on large bones of ungulates
16 which it obtains from fresh carcasses and swallows whole or in pieces.

17 In Spain, where the bulk of the current European population is
18 located, the species reached its lowest levels in the 1970s, when fewer
19 than 40 occupied breeding territories remained in the Pyrenees. After a
20 period of stability up to 1987, the population of this vulture increased to
21 90 occupied territories by 2002 (Heredia & Margalida 2002) and to 150
22 by 2011 (Spanish bearded vulture working group unpublished data).
23 However, this increase occurred only within a restricted geographical
24 area, leading to a rise in population density (Donázar *et al.* 2005).

1 The whole bearded vulture population in the Aragonese Spanish
2 Pyrenees area (approx. 7600 km²) was monitored for 25 years from
3 1988 to 2012 inclusive. Each year, all known territories as well as other
4 potential breeding areas were carefully searched for birds, nests or
5 other signs of occupancy during the breeding season (November to
6 August). Occupied territories were located on the basis of territorial or
7 courtship activity and breeding parameters were then recorded on later
8 visits (see Margalida *et al.* 2003). At the population level, productivity
9 was measured as the mean number of fledglings raised per territorial
10 pair, including breeding failures and taking into account that no more
11 than one nestling could be reared per breeding attempt. Territories
12 occupied for more than 15 years (i.e. since 1997) were considered as
13 first occupied territories in the analyses. In general, once a territory was
14 occupied, it remained occupied throughout the remaining period of
15 study.

16

17 SUPPLEMENTARY FEEDING

18 In order to avoid competition with other more generalist scavengers,
19 such as griffon vultures (*Gyps fulvus*) or corvids, a specific diet was
20 provided for individual reproductive units based on sheep and goat
21 bones. These were the 3rd and 4th metatarsal and metacarpal together
22 with the remaining limb up to the finger bones. They were collected
23 from authorized slaughter houses, where under official regulations,
24 these materials are considered as surplus waste. In all cases, the bones

1 were conveyed by veterinary officials in watertight barrels to the feeding
2 point.

3 Supplementary feeding was conducted over four years (2007-
4 2010) with the aim of improving the physical condition of particular
5 breeders in the pre-laying period, and stimulating the laying of viable
6 eggs. Supplementary feeding started on 31 October and finished on 31
7 March, about 30 days after egg laying. Some 350 working days and 980
8 hours were dedicated to this operation. Technical workers walked to the
9 nesting areas to deposit 15-18 kg of bones each day, at a medium
10 distance of 1118.5 ± 999.1 m (range: 50-3900 m, n = 14) from the
11 nest. The food was placed on ledges supposedly unreachable by other
12 carnivores, but on at least 7 occasions other species were seen at the
13 food (*Corvus corax*, *Corvus corone*, *Gyps fulvus*, *Milvus milvus*, *Vulpes*
14 *vulpes*, *Martes martes*). Nevertheless, the most frequently observed
15 species using the food was by far the bearded vulture. Only the local
16 pair visited each feeding site, and indeed no more than one or two
17 bearded vultures were seen there at one time. Around 5108 kg of bones
18 were supplied during the four years, divided among 10 different
19 territories. The selected experimental territories were considered as
20 low quality or "sink" territories because they had a laying rate (number
21 of years with egg laying per number of monitored years) below the
22 population mean (0.69 layings per year). They were also accessible by
23 car even during heavy snow, and the topography allowed access on foot
24 close to the nest.

1

2 SIMULATIONS

3 We conducted simulations to analyze the viability of a hypothetical
4 reintroduction program, based on the extra young produced by
5 supplementary feeding. We used Vortex simulation software (Vortex,
6 version 9.72, Lacy *et al.* 2005). Vortex is an individual-based model for
7 population viability analyses (PVA). It models population dynamics as
8 discrete, sequential events that occur according to probabilities defined
9 by the user and modelled as constants or random variables that follow
10 specified distributions. The events used for modelling describe the
11 typical life cycle of sexually reproducing, diploid organisms. The method
12 is particularly suitable for species like the one we modelled here, with
13 low fecundity, long lifespan, small population size, estimable age-
14 specific fecundity and survival rates, and mainly monogamous breeding
15 (Lacy 2000). In fact, Vortex has already been used to analyze the
16 viability of bearded vulture populations (Bustamante 1996, 1998).

17 Using previously published estimates of fecundity and mortality
18 rates for the species (Bustamante 1998; Margalida *et al.* 2003; Oro *et*
19 *al.* 2008; Table 1), we conducted several simulations for different
20 scenarios. For each scenario, we performed 1000 replicates during a
21 simulated 50-year period. We selected this period because it is the
22 double of the known reproductive life for this species (age at first
23 breeding 7 years, maximum age of reproduction 32 years, see table 1).
24 Negative density-dependent fecundity was considered in all the

1 simulations (Table 1). The equation that *Vortex* uses to model density
2 dependence is: $P(N) = P(0) - [P(0) - P(K)N/K^B]$. where $P(N)$ is the percentage
3 of females that breed when the population size is N , $P(K)$ is the
4 percentage that breed when the population is at carrying capacity (K),
5 and $P(0)$ is the percentage that breed when the population is close to
6 zero . The exponent B can be any positive number and determines the
7 shape of the curve relating the percentage breeding to population size,
8 as the population becomes large. If $B = 1$, the percentage breeding
9 changes linearly with population size. If $B = 2$, $P(N)$ is a quadratic
10 function of N . As can be seen in Figure 2, the relationship between
11 number of pairs and fecundity was significantly linear, so a value of $B=1$
12 was selected for modeling purposes.

13 First, we examined the dynamics of released bearded vultures in a
14 simulated reintroduction program. We calculated the number of
15 juveniles that would be available to release each year and the number
16 of years required to achieve a new population. We estimated juvenile
17 mortality (from 1 to 6 years old) using data from the reintroduction
18 program conducted by the Gypaetus Foundation in Spain
19 (<http://www.gypaetus.org/>, Table 1). We consider a new population as
20 successfully established when the probability of extinction during 50
21 years (that is twice the reproductive life) was less than 0.001 ($P <$
22 0.001) and it showed a positive trend in population size. We simulated
23 reintroduction programs lasting from 2 to 13 years in duration,
24 calculating the minimum number of juveniles we would have to release

1 each year assuming a 1:1 sex ratio. A population ceiling of 70 pairs was
2 considered in these simulations because the selected area for potential
3 reintroduction in Picos de Europa Mountains is of similar size to the
4 Aragonese population.

5 Second, we simulated the effect on the Aragonese bearded
6 vulture population of repeated extractions of the minimum number of
7 young needed for a successful reintroduction according to previous
8 simulations, with and without food supplementation. In these
9 simulations a population ceiling of 70 breeding pairs was considered.
10 Juvenile mortality (between 1 and 6 year of age) used was derived from
11 published data of this population (Table 1). Simulations started with an
12 age distribution of a stable population.

13

14 COST ANALYSIS

15 In order to analyse the relative financial costs of alternative
16 approaches to obtaining young for reintroduction, we compared the
17 budget of a typical captive breeding program, namely the one
18 conducted by the Gypaetus Foundation in Spain
19 (<http://www.gypaetus.org/>), with the cost of a supplementary
20 feeding program (like the one conducted by Fundación para la
21 Conservación del Quebrantahuesos in the Pyrenees;
22 <http://www.quebrantahuesos.org/>), plus the necessary care of the
23 extracted young until the age of release. We also estimated the
24 annual cost of a standard reintroduction program, based on young

1 taken from unfed wild pairs, using data from the following programs
2 developed in Spain: Osprey reintroductions in Huelva and Cádiz
3 (Muriel *et al.* 2010), Spanish imperial eagle reintroduction in Cádiz
4 (Madero & Ferrer 2002; Muriel *et al.* 2011) and Bearded vulture
5 reintroduction (<http://www.gypaetus.org/>) in Cazorla (Simón *et al.*
6 2005). Obviously the costs could change through time, but it is the
7 relative costs of the different procedures that are important here.

8

9 STATISTICAL ANALYSES

10 We tested for trends in fecundity with linear analysis using the *F*-ratio
11 statistic to find whether the slope of the data was significantly different
12 from zero. Variances of the linear models were tested for homogeneity
13 using Cochran's *C* statistic. Generalized linear models (GLM) with
14 binomial distribution and logit link function were used to examine
15 differences in productivity among territories as well as to compare
16 productivity in the same territories with and without supplementary
17 feeding. Statistical significance was set at $P < 0.05$ and analyses were
18 conducted using the STATISTICA 8.0 package (Statsoft Inc., Tulsa,
19 USA).

20

21 **Results**

22 DENSITY-DEPENDENT FECUNDITY

23 The population of bearded vultures in Aragon increased throughout the
24 25-year study period from 29 occupied territories in 1988 up to 78 in

1 2012 (Fig. 1), which represents an increase of 269%. During the same
2 period, the trend in fecundity was significantly negative, decreasing
3 from a mean value of 0.56 young per occupied territory during the first
4 8 years to 0.36 during the last 8 years ($r = -0.663$, $n = 22$, $P < 0.001$;
5 Fig. 1). In addition, a significant negative relationship between fecundity
6 and number of breeding pairs was found ($r = -0.655$, $n = 22$, $P <$
7 0.001 ; Fig. 2), suggesting the action of a density-dependent fecundity
8 process.

9 Significant differences of fecundity among territories were found
10 (GLM with binomial distribution and logit link function; Wald statistic =
11 156.45, $P < 0.001$), with some territories showing consistently high
12 values of fecundity throughout the study, and others consistently low
13 values. Comparing fecundity between those territories occupied for
14 longer than 15 years and recently occupied territories, using only the
15 last 10 years, a significant difference was found (GLM with binomial
16 distribution and logit link function; Wald statistic = 4.73, $P = 0.029$, Fig.
17 3), with higher fecundity in old territories (mean = 0.372 young per
18 territory and year) than in recently occupied ones (mean = 0.288). In
19 other words, the decline in mean fecundity was caused by the
20 progressive addition of less productive territories to the population, the
21 occupants of which bred poorly throughout.

22

23 SUPPLEMENTARY FEEDING

24 Comparing the production of chicks in the 10 selected poor territories

1 between the periods with (2007-2010) and without (2001-2006)
2 supplementary feeding, highly significant differences were found.
3 Average annual production of young in those 10 nests during the 6
4 years without supplementary food was 0.078 against 0.541 during the 4
5 years with supplementary food. This significant change (GLM with
6 binomial distribution and logit link function; Wald statistic = 8.617, $P =$
7 0.003), represents a seven-fold (693.6 %) increase in the expected
8 number of young per nest. On the other hand, territories without
9 supplementary food showed no significant change in average production
10 between those two periods (GLM with binomial distribution and logit link
11 function; Wald statistic = 2.758, $P = 0.948$). From these results, we can
12 predict that supplementary feeding in all the 15 poorest territories of
13 the population (i.e. those with an average annual egg laying rate below
14 the population mean, i.e. 0.69 laying events per year), whose mean
15 annual production of young per pair was 0.103 (total annual young =
16 1.545) would become $0.541 \times 15 = 8.115$ young (between 5 and 11; P
17 = 0.05), roughly equivalent to 7 extra young per year.

18

19 SIMULATIONS

20 The number of young released necessary to obtain a new successful
21 population (with a probability of extinction of $P < 0.001$ during 50 years)
22 varies from 54 per year over two years to 4 per year over 23 years (Fig.
23 4), with number of young per year showing a significant negative
24 exponential relationship with number of years ($r = - 0.788$, $P < 0.001$).

1 Consequently, as we reduce the number of young released each year,
2 the number of years necessary to obtain a successful population
3 increases exponentially. Analysing only the cases between 2 and 13
4 years, a significant effect of number of young per year on the final size
5 of the simulated population was found ($r = - 0.614$, $P = 0.033$), with
6 higher mean population levels as the number of young released per year
7 increased, thereby shortening the reintroduction period. After 50 years,
8 the mean final population size in simulations with 54 young released
9 during two years was 33.1 breeding pairs against 22.7 when releasing 7
10 young during 13 years (Fig. 5). Therefore, if we only released the 7
11 extra young produced by supplementary feeding we would need at least
12 13 years of releases to obtain a new population with a probability of
13 extinction of $P < 0.001$.

14 In simulating the effect on the donor population of the removal of
15 nestlings, we only considered extractions of up to 26 young per year, as
16 this is roughly the mean number of young produced by the whole
17 population of Aragon each year. Consequently, only extraction
18 programmes of 4 or more years were simulated. As shown in Fig. 6, the
19 effect on the donor population varies significantly according to the
20 extraction program ($r = - 0.896$, $P < 0.001$).

21 As the extraction period lengthened, the size of the modelled
22 donor population after 50 years became lower. If we removed 26 young
23 over each of four successive years, the mean donor population size after
24 50 years became 246 individuals, against 184 if we removed 7 young

1 during each of 13 successive years. However, the number of breeding
2 pairs was the same at the end of all these simulations (70, i.e.
3 maximum possible; Fig. 6). The magnitude of temporary decreases in
4 the number of breeding pairs in donor populations was related to the
5 length of the extraction period ($r = 0.941$, $P = 0.017$), ranging between
6 36.3% (from 70 to 44.57 pairs) in four-year extraction programmes to
7 13.7% in 13 year programmes. In any case, the probability of extinction
8 of the donor populations was always below 0.001.

9 Conducting the same simulations under a supplementary feeding
10 program (i.e. assuming that we are able to produce 7 extra young),
11 again the probability of extinction was lower than 0.001 for all the
12 scenarios (Fig. 7). The effect of different extraction programs on the
13 donor population was consistently less than in the previous simulations,
14 and the length of the extraction programs had no influence on the final
15 donor population size ($r = 0.330$, $P = 0.385$). Temporal reduction in
16 number of breeding pairs varies from 18.2% (from 70 to 57.24 pairs) in
17 four-year extraction programs to 0% in 13-year programs. In fact,
18 extractions varying from 10 young over 10 years to 7 young over 13
19 years seem to have no effect on the size of the donor population (Fig.
20 7).

21

22 ANALYSIS OF LIKELY COSTS

23 We compared the relative costs of a captive breeding program
24 producing 7 young bearded vultures per year against the alternative

1 approach of supplementary feeding of wild birds in poor territories. The
2 annual cost of a captive breeding program for this species, as currently
3 running in Andalusia, Spain (<http://www.gypaetus.org/>), is 700,000 €,
4 including the cost of the releases in the Cazorla mountains (SE Spain)
5 where an average of 2.7 young per year have been released during the
6 last 6 years. This gives a total budget of 9,100,000 € to maintain the
7 program during the necessary 13 years, releasing at least 7 young per
8 year, to obtain a self-sustaining population in the new area, assuming
9 that the production of 7 young per year would not increase the current
10 budget.

11 In contrast, the cost of the supplementary feeding program in the
12 Aragonese Pyrenees plus the additional cost of raising the extracted 7
13 young until their release by hacking, together with all other associated
14 costs of the program, give an estimated annual budget of 100,000 €,
15 which is seven times less than the approach based on captive breeding.
16 Using the supplementary feeding technique, the total cost of a
17 reintroduction program during the 13 necessary years would be
18 1,300,000 €. In other words, for the money needed for a captive
19 breeding and release program, we could conduct up to seven different
20 reintroduction programmes using this new approach, providing that
21 sufficient young were available.

22 A major component of the total cost is the number of years
23 needed to maintain a programme. According to our simulations, a 4-
24 year program would be successful providing that 26 young were

1 available per year. This means that during 4 consecutive years we
2 would have to remove almost all the young of the donor population
3 (without supplementary food). Although no risk of extinction for the
4 donor population would exist, some effects on the size of the total
5 population would be expected during the first 10 years until it had fully
6 recovered (see Figs. 6, 7). The total budget needed, however, would be
7 400,000€, that is almost 23 times less than the money needed for the
8 actual captive breeding and release program.

9

10 **Discussion**

11 Our studied population of bearded vultures in the Aragonese Pyrenees
12 showed density-dependent fecundity regulation, as suggested by the
13 highly significant negative relationship found between mean fecundity
14 and density. The fact that first occupied territories showed higher
15 fecundity throughout than newly-occupied ones is in accordance with
16 the HHH as the main driver of density-dependent fecundity in this
17 population. As expected under the HHH, the decrease in mean fecundity
18 over the years was mainly due to an increase in the proportion of poor
19 territories occupied as the population increased, while reproductive units
20 on first occupied territories maintained a high mean fecundity (e.g.
21 Newton 1991; Dhondt, Kempenaers & Adriaensen 1992; Kempenaers &
22 Dhondt 1992; Ferrer & Donazar 1996; Krüger & Lindström 2001; Sergio
23 & Newton 2003). Significant fecundity differences among territories
24 support this pattern as well. In this situation, the population can be

1 viewed as a source-sink system, with sink territories being maintained
2 due to 'overproduction' of young in source territories (Pulliam &
3 Danielson 1991; Ferrer & Donazar 1996). Other authors have previously
4 suggested that this bearded vulture population was under HHH
5 regulation, at least partially (Carrete, Donazar & Margalida 2006).

6 Nevertheless, some other factors would explain why old territories
7 show a consistently higher fecundity than recently-occupied ones. For
8 example, old territories could be occupied by older and/or higher quality
9 breeders than new territories so that age-differences would confound
10 any effects of territory quality. This seems improbable, however, due to
11 a general trend in long-lived raptor species with deferred maturity to
12 increase the mean age at first breeding as population density increases
13 (Ferrer *et al.* 2004). This tendency has already been suggested for the
14 growing population of the bearded vulture in the Pyrenees (Antor *et al.*
15 2008). Furthermore, in the longest occupied territories much turnover of
16 breeders would have been expected in the 25-year study period,
17 because every few individuals would have been expected to live to the
18 maximum possible breeding age. Lastly, even if an age effect was
19 operating and the positive effect of food supplementation depended on
20 inexperienced individuals more than on territory quality, it could not
21 have affected the results or the rationale behind the simulations. As
22 long as some territories responded to supplementary feeding by
23 increasing fecundity, the extraction of those 'extra young' would have
24 had the same effect on the viability of the donor population, regardless

1 of whether it resulted from territory quality, breeder quality or both.

2 Supplementary feeding increased fecundity in poor territories by
3 more than 690%. This contrasts with an earlier study by Magalida
4 (2010) who found no such effect. However, Margalida (2010) provided
5 supplementary food only from hatching and during the following two
6 months, so it could not have affected egg laying. In our case, food
7 provision started well before laying, thereby increasing the proportion of
8 pairs that laid and thus their fecundity. For supplementary feeding to be
9 effective, it must be applied at the right time. If the main objective is to
10 increase the proportion of Bearded Vulture pairs laying eggs,
11 supplementary feeding must start well before laying in order to affect
12 female condition,(for general discussion of efficacy of management
13 techniques see Ferrer & Hiraldo 1991).

14 Cost analyses, based on recent comparative price levels, show
15 that the use of captive breeding as a source of young for a
16 reintroduction program is seven times more expensive than extraction
17 of overproduced young from a food-supplemented wild population. The
18 necessary maintenance of the facility, year-round labour costs and food
19 supply for the captive animals, account for those differences. In
20 addition, the probability of success is often lower in reintroduction
21 programs using captive-born animals owing to factors such as lower
22 survival rates, inappropriate behaviour or poor adaptation to local
23 conditions (reviews in, Griffith *et al.* 1989; Beck *et al.* 1994; Snyder *et*
24 *al.* 1996; Wolf *et al.* 1996).

1 In all the scenarios examined, extractions of young had non-
2 significant effects on the viability of the donor population with or without
3 stimulating extra production of young by means of supplementary
4 feeding in poor territories. Nevertheless, in the absence of appropriate
5 food supplementation during the extraction period, the simulated donor
6 population was significantly affected, losing breeding pairs. This
7 temporary decrease in population size had no effect on the extinction
8 probability over 50 years, but the simulated population took some years
9 to recover its previous size, which could have negative effects on public
10 opinion, hampering support for the programme. Moreover, population
11 size was more affected as the extraction period lengthened, suggesting
12 that extractions of young would be best concentrated into a period as
13 short as possible.

14 On the other hand, using food supplementation in target
15 territories, the expected production of extra young allowed their
16 removal without any effect on the donor population, in either the short-
17 term or long term. Using these extra young, a 13-year reintroduction
18 could be started with a probability of extinction for both the donor and
19 the new population of $P < 0.001$. This would help to avoid any negative
20 public perception of the management plan and would be cheaper than a
21 captive breeding and release program, but must be maintained for at
22 least 13 years. Probably a combination of both strategies would be the
23 best compromise option, i.e. an overproduction of young and the
24 removal of additional young in order to reduce the duration of the

1 program.

2 Many endangered species could benefit from this approach,
3 especially those that now exist as isolated but dense populations.
4 Extending the overall distribution, and increasing the connectivity
5 between subpopulations, could be one of the most effective
6 conservation measures that could be undertaken. Reintroduction
7 programmes of various animals have increased greatly during the last
8 25 years, and will probably be increasingly used in the future (Seddon
9 *et al.* 2007). In this context, the use of population dynamics theory
10 applied to conservation could reduce the costs of these interventions,
11 increase the probability of success, and avoid problems related to
12 negative impacts on donor populations and public opinion.

13

14 **References**

- 15 Andrewartha, H.G. & Birch, I.C. (1954) *The distribution and abundance of*
16 *animals*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- 17 Antor, R.J., Margalida, A., Frey, H., Heredia, R., Lorente, L., & Sesé
18 J.A. (2007) First breeding age in captive and wild Bearded
19 Vultures *Gypaetus barbatus*. *Acta Ornithologica*, **42**, 114–118.
- 20 Beck, B.B., Rapaport, L.G., Price, M.S. & Wilson, A. (1994) Reintro-
21 duction of captive-born animals. *Creative conservation:*
22 *Interactive management of wild and captive animals* (eds P.J.S.
23 Olney, G.M. Mace & A.T.C. Feistner), pp. 265-284. Chapman &
24 Hall, London.

- 1 Brown, J.L. (1969) Territorial behavior and population regulation in
2 birds. *Wilson Bulletin*, **81**, 293-329.
- 3 Brown, L.H. (1977) The status, population structure, and breeding dates
4 of the African Lammergeier. *Journal of Raptor Research*, **11**, 49–
5 80.
- 6 Bustamante, J. (1996) Population viability analysis of captive and
7 released bearded vulture populations. *Conservation Biology*, **10**,
8 822–831.
- 9 Bustamante, J. (1998) Use of simulation models to plan species
10 reintroductions: the case of the bearded vulture in southern
11 Spain. *Animal Conservation*, **1**, 229-238.
- 12 Carrete, M., Donázar, J.A. & Margalida, A. (2006) Density-dependent
13 productivity depression in Pyrenean bearded vultures: implications
14 for conservation. *Ecological Applications*, **16**, 1674-1682.
- 15 Cooch, E.G., Lank, D.B., Rockwell, R.F. & Cooke, F. (1989) Long-term
16 decline in fecundity in a snow goose population: Evidence for
17 density dependence? *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **58**, 711-726.
- 18 Dhondt, A.A., Kempenaers, B. & Adriaensen, F. (1992). Density-
19 dependent clutch size caused by habitat heterogeneity. *Journal of*
20 *Animal Ecology*, **61**, 643-648.
- 21 Dhondt, A.A. & Schillemans, J. (1983) Reproductive success of the great
22 tit in relation to its territorial status. *Animal Behaviour*, **31**,
23 902-912.
- 24 Donázar, J.A., Hiraldo, F. & Bustamante, J. (1993). Factors influencing

- 1 nest site selection, breeding density and breeding success in the
2 bearded vulture (*Gypaetus barbatus*). *Journal of Applied Ecology*,
3 **30**, 504-514.
- 4 Donázar, J.A., Margalida, A., Bustamante, J., Hernández, F.J., Romero-
5 Pujante, M.D., Antor, R.J., García, D., Campeón, D. & Heredia, R.
6 (2005) Aplicación de modelos predictivos en la selección del cortado
7 de nidificación por el quebrantahuesos en los Pirineos: cambios a
8 largo plazo (1991-2002). *Biología de la Conservación del*
9 *Quebrantahuesos Gypaetus barbatus en España* (eds A. Margalida &
10 R. Heredia), pp. 139-152. Organismo Autónomo de Parques
11 Nacionales, Madrid.
- 12 Ferguson-Lees, J., & Christie, D.A.. (2003) *Raptors of the world*.
13 Christopher Helm, London.
- 14 Fernandez, C., Azkona, P. & Donazar, J.A. (1998) Density dependent
15 effects on productivity in the griffon vulture *Gyps fulvus*: the role
16 of interference and habitat heterogeneity. *Ibis*, **140**, 64–69.
- 17 Ferrer, M. & Bisson, I. (2003) Age and territory quality effects on
18 fecundity in Spanish Imperial eagle (*Aquila adalberti*). *Auk*, **120**,
19 180-186.
- 20 Ferrer, M. & Donazar, J.A. (1996) Density-dependent fecundity by habitat
21 heterogeneity in an increasing population of Spanish imperial
22 eagles. *Ecology*, **77**, 69-74.

- 1 Ferrer, M. & Hiraldo, F. (1991) Evaluation of management techniques
2 for the Spanish imperial eagle. *The Wildlife Society Bulletin*, **19**,
3 436-442.
- 4 Ferrer, M., Newton, I. & Casado, E. (2006) How to test different density
5 dependent fecundity hypotheses in an increasing or stable
6 population. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **75**, 111-117.
- 7 Ferrer, M., Newton, I. & Casado, E. (2008) Density dependence
8 hypotheses and the distribution of fecundity. *Journal of Animal
9 Ecology*, **77**, 341-345.
- 10 Ferrer, M., Otarola, F. & Garcia-Ruiz, J.M. (2004) Density-dependent
11 age of first reproduction as a buffer affecting persistence of small
12 populations. *Ecological Applications*, **14**, 616-624.
- 13 Ferrer, M. & Penteriani, V. (2007) Supplementary feeding and the
14 population dynamic of the Spanish imperial Eagle. *Ardeola*, **54**,
15 359-363.
- 16 Fretwell, S.D. & Lucas, H.L. (1970) On territorial behaviour and other
17 factors influencing habitat distribution in birds. I theoretical
18 development. *Acta Biotheoretica*, **19**, 16-36.
- 19 González, L.M., Margalida, A., Sánchez, R. & Oria, J. (2006)
20 Supplementary feeding as an effective tool for improving breeding
21 success in the Spanish imperial eagle (*Aquila adalberti*). *Biological
22 Conservation*, **129**, 477-486.

- 1 Griffith, B.J., Scott, J.M., Carpenter, J.W. & Reed, C. (1989)
2 Translocation as a species conservation tool: status and strategy.
3 *Science*, **245**, 477-480.
- 4 Grubac, B. (2002) Le statut du Gypaète barbu *Gypaetus barbatus* en
5 Yougoslavie et Macédonie. *Proceedings of the International*
6 *Conference "Conservation of Bearded Vulture Populations"* (eds
7 LPO-FIR), pp. 53–60. LPO, Paris.
- 8 Heredia, R. (2005) Status y distribución del quebrantahuesos en España
9 y diagnóstico de la situación de la población en la UE. *Biología de*
10 *la Conservación del Quebrantahuesos Gypaetus barbatur en*
11 *España* (eds A. Margalida & R. Heredia), pp. 21-37. Organismo
12 Autónomo Parques Nacionales, Madrid.
- 13 Heredia, R. & Heredia, B. (1991) *El Quebrantahuesos (Gypaetus*
14 *barbatus) en los Pirineos. Características ecológicas y biología de*
15 *la conservación*. ICONA, Colección Técnica, Madrid.
- 16 Heredia, R. & Margalida, A. (2002) Statut et evolution de la population
17 de Gypaète barbu (*Gypaetus barbatus*) en Espagne. *Proceedings*
18 *of the International Conference "Conservation of Bearded Vulture*
19 *populations"* (eds LPO-FIR), pp. 61-65. LPO, Paris.
- 20 Hiraldo, F., Delibes, M. & Calderón, J. (1979) *El quebrantahuesos*
21 *Gypaetus barbatus (L.)*. *Monografías 22*. ICONA, Madrid.
- 22 IUCN (World Conservation Union) (1998) *Guidelines for reintroductions*.
23 IUCN/SSC Re-introduction Specialist Group, IUCN, Gland,
24 Cambridge.

- 1 IUCN (2012) The IUCN Redlist of Threatened Species. Version 2012.2.
2 <http://www.iucnredlist.org/>
- 3 Kempenaers, B. & Dhondt, A.A. (1992) Experimental test of a hypothesis
4 explaining density dependent clutch-size in tits *Parus* spp. *Ibis*,
5 **134**, 192-194.
- 6 Kokko, H., Harris, M. P. & Wanless, S. (2004). Competition for breeding
7 sites and site-dependent population regulation in a highly colonial
8 seabird, the common guillemot *Uria aalge*. *Journal of Animal*
9 *Ecology*, **73**, 367–376.
- 10 Krüger, O. & Lindström, J. (2001) Habitat heterogeneity affects
11 population growth in goshawk *Accipiter gentilis*. *Journal of Animal*
12 *Ecology*, **70**, 173-181.
- 13 Lack, D. (1954) *The natural regulation of animal numbers*. Oxford
14 University Press, New York.
- 15 Lack, D. (1966) *Population studies of birds*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- 16 Lacy, R.C. (2000) Structure of the VORTEX Simulation Model for
17 Population Viability Analysis. *Ecological Bulletins*, **48**, 191-203.
- 18 Lacy, R.C., Borbat, M. & Pollack, J.P., (2005) *VORTEX: A Stochastic*
19 *Simulation of the Extinction Process. Version 9.50*. Chicago
20 Zoological Society, Brookfield.
- 21 Madero, A. & Ferrer, M. (2002) *Proyecto de Reintroducción del Águila*
22 *Imperial Ibérica en Cádiz*. Consejería de Medio Ambiente, Junta de
23 Andalucía, Jaén.
24 http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/medioambiente/web/Bloques_Te

- 1 [maticos/Publicaciones_Divulgacion_Y_Noticias/Documentos_Tecni](#)
2 [cos/Aguila_Imperial/aguila2.pdf](#)
- 3 Margalida et al 1997. *Ardeola* 44: 109-111.
- 4 Margalida, A., García, D., Bertran, J. & Heredia, R. (2003) Breeding
5 biology and success of the bearded vulture *Gypaetus barbatus* in
6 the eastern Pyrenees. *Ibis*, **145**, 244–252
- 7 Margalida, A. (2010) Supplementary feeding during the chick-rearing
8 period is ineffective in increasing the breeding success in the
9 bearded vulture (*Gypaetus barbatus*). *European Journal of Wildlife*
10 *Research*, **56**, 673-678.
- 11 Mingozi, T. & Estève, R. (1997) Analysis of a historical extirpation of
12 the Bearded Vulture *Gypaetus barbatus* (L.) in the western Alps
13 (France-Italy): former distribution and causes of extirpation.
14 *Biological Conservation*, **79**, 155–171.
- 15 Muriel, R., Ferrer, M., Casado, E. & Calabuig, C.P. (2010) First successful
16 breeding of reintroduced ospreys *Pandion haliaetus* in mainland
17 Spain. *Ardeola*, **57**, 175-180.
- 18 Muriel, R., Ferrer, M., Casado, E., Madero, A. & Calabuig, C.P. (2011)
19 Settlement and successful breeding of reintroduced Spanish
20 imperial eagles *Aquila adalberti* in the province of Cadiz (Spain).
21 *Ardeola*, **58**, 323-333.
- 22 Newton, I. (1991) Habitat variation and population regulation in
23 Sparrowhawks. *Ibis*, **133**, 76-88.
- 24 Newton, I. (1994) Experiments on the limitation of bird breeding

- 1 densities: a review. *Ibis*, **136**, 397-441.
- 2 Newton, I. (1998) *Population limitation in birds*. Academic Press,
3 London.
- 4 Newton, I., & Marquiss, M. (1976) Occupancy and success of nesting
5 territories in the European Sparrowhawk. *Journal of Raptor*
6 *Research*, **10**, 65-71.
- 7 Newton, I. & Marquiss, M. (1981) Effect of additional food on laying dates
8 and clutch sizes of Sparrowhawks. *Ornis Scandinavica*, **12**, 224-
9 229.
- 10 Nicholson, A.J. (1933) The balance of animal populations. *Journal of*
11 *Animal Ecology*, **2**, 132-178.
- 12 Oro D., Margalida A., Carrete M., Heredia R. & Donazar JA (2008).
13 Testing the goodness of supplementary feeding to enhance
14 population viability in an endangered vulture. *PLoS one*, **3**, e4084.
15 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0004084
- 16 Penteriani, V., Gallardo, M. & Roche, P. (2002) Landscape structure and
17 food supply affect eagle owl (*Bubo bubo*) density and breeding
18 performance: a case of intra-population heterogeneity. *Journal of*
19 *Zoology*, **257**, 365-372.
- 20 Penteriani, V., Balbontin, J. & Ferrer, M. (2003) Simultaneous effects of
21 age and territory quality on fecundity in Bonelli's eagle *Hieraetus*
22 *fasciatus*. *Ibis*, **145**, (online) E77-E82.
- 23 Pulliam, H.R. & Danielson, B.J. (1991) Sources, sinks, and habitat
24 selection: a landscape perspective on population dynamics.

- 1 *American Naturalist*, **137**, 50-66.
- 2 Rodenhouse, N.L., Sherry, T.W. & Holmes, R.T. (1997) Site-dependent
3 regulation of population size: a new synthesis. *Ecology*, **78**, 2025-
4 2042.
- 5 Seddon, P.J., Armstrong, D.P. & Maloney, R.F. (2007) Developing the
6 science of reintroduction biology. *Conservation Biology*, **21**, 303-
7 312.
- 8 Seddon, P.J. (2010) From reintroduction to assisted colonization:
9 moving along the conservation translocation spectrum.
10 *Restoration Ecology*, **18**, 796-802.
- 11 Sergio, F. & Newton, I. (2003) Occupancy as a measure of territory
12 quality. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **72**, 857-865.
- 13 Simón, M.A., Llopis, Á., Carrasco, A.L., Godino, A., Bautista, F., Romero,
14 M.D., Hernández, F.J., del Barco, M., Macías, E. & Hortelano, M.A.
15 (2005) El Proyecto de Reintroducción del quebrantahuesos en
16 Andalucía: resultados del centro de cría del Guadalentín. *Biología*
17 *de la Conservación del Quebrantahuesos Gypaetus barbatus en*
18 *España* (eds A. Margalida & R. Heredia), pp 255-268. Organismo
19 Autónomo Parques Nacionales, Madrid.
- 20 Sinclair, A.R.E. (1989) Population regulation in animals. *Ecological*
21 *concepts* (ed J.M. Cherret), pp 197-241. Blackwell Scientific,
22 Oxford.
- 23 Snyder, N.F.R., Derrickson, S.R., Beissinger, S.R., Wiley, J.W., Smith,
24 T.B., Toone, W.D. & Miller, B. (1996) Limitations of Captive

- 1 Breeding in Endangered Species. *Conservation Biology*, **10**, 338-
2 348.
- 3 Thaler, E. & Pechlaner, H. (1980) Cainism in the Lammergeier or
4 Bearded Vulture *Gypaetus barbatus* at Innsbruck Alpenzoo.
5 *International Zoo Yearbook*, **20**, 278-280.
- 6 Terrasse, J.F. (1985) The effects of artificial feeding on Griffon, Bearded
7 and Egyptian Vultures in the Pyrenees. *Conservation studies on*
8 *raptors. ICBP Techn. Publ. No. 5* (eds I. Newton & R.D.
9 Chancellor), pp. 429–430. ICBP, Cambridge.
- 10 Tucker, G. & Heath, M. (1994) *Birds in Europe. Their conservation*
11 *status*. Birdlife International, Cambridge.
- 12 Wiehn, J. & Korpimaki, E. (1997) Food limitation on brood size:
13 experimental evidence in the Eurasian kestrel. *Ecology*, **78**,2043–
14 2050.
- 15 Wilbur, S.R., Carrier, W.D. & Borneman, J.C. (1974) Supplemental
16 feeding program for California Condors. *Journal of Wildlife*
17 *Management*, **38**, 343–346.
- 18 Wolf, C.M., Griffith B., Reed, C. & Temple, S.A. (1996) Avian and
19 mammalian translocations: update and reanalysis of 1987 survey
20 data. *Conservation Biology*, **10**, 1142-1154.

21


1 **Table 1.** Summary of parameter values used in Vortex for the
 2 simulations of trends in the donor population and in the hypothetical
 3 reintroduced population. Based on data from Bustamante (1998),
 4 Margalida *et al.* (2003), Oro *et al.* (2008)

5

Parameter	Value
Age of first breeding	7 years
Maximum age of reproduction	32 years
Maximum number of broods per year	1 brood
Maximum progeny per brood	1 young
Sex ratio at birth	50%
Fecundity rate (density dependence)	0.6 at low density 0.35 at high density
Juvenile mortality in Pyrenees (1-6 years)	21% (SD 1.8)
Annual adult annual mortality (>6 years old)	13% (SD 1.4)
Juvenile mortality of released birds (1-6 years)	50% (SD 1.2)

6


7



1

2 **Fig. 1.** Growth of the population (number of occupied territories) and
 3 average fecundity (fledglings per year) of the bearded vulture in Aragon
 4 (Spanish Pyrenees) throughout the study period (1988-2012, inclusive).

5



1

2 **Fig. 2.** Significant negative relationship between density and mean
 3 fecundity ($r = -0.717$, $n = 25$, $P < 0.001$) in the bearded vulture
 4 population of Aragon (Spanish Pyrenees). Dotted lines represent 95%
 5 confidence intervals. Fecundity is measured as the mean number of
 6 young produced per reproductive pair or unit.


7



1

2 **Fig. 3.** Significant (GLM Binomial distribution and logit link function,
3 Wald statistic = 4.73, $P = 0.029$) differences in fecundity between old
4 territories (those occupied more than 15 years ago) and new ones (less
5 than 10 years ago).


6



1


2 **Fig. 4.** Negative exponential relationship between number of young
3 released per year and number of years necessary to obtain a probability
4 of extinction below 0.001 in a simulation period of 50 years.

5




1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

Fig. 5. Trajectories of new populations according different combinations of young released per year and duration of the releases (2 years-54 young, 4 years-26 young, 6 years-18 young, 8 years-14 young, 10 years-10 young and 13 years-7 young).



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Fig. 6. Effect of different combinations of young removed per year and number of years of extraction on the number of breeding pairs in the donor population without a supplementary feeding programme (4 years-26 young, 6 years-18 young, 8 years-14 young, 10 years-10 young and 13 years-7 young).



1
2

3

4 **Fig. 7.** Effect of different combinations of young removed per year and
 5 number of years of extraction on number of breeding pairs of the donor
 6 population with a supplementary feeding programme producing an extra
 7 7 young per year (4 years-26 young, 6 years-18 young, 8 years-14
 8 young, 10 years-10 young and 13 years-7 young).