

Comparative distribution of Syrian and great spotted woodpeckers in different landscapes of Poland

Authors: Kajtoch, Łukasz, and Figarski, Tomasz

Source: Folia Zoologica, 66(1) : 29-36

Published By: Institute of Vertebrate Biology, Czech Academy of Sciences

URL: <https://doi.org/10.25225/fozo.v66.i1.a5.2017>

BioOne Complete (complete.BioOne.org) is a full-text database of 200 subscribed and open-access titles in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences published by nonprofit societies, associations, museums, institutions, and presses.

Your use of this PDF, the BioOne Complete website, and all posted and associated content indicates your acceptance of BioOne's Terms of Use, available at www.bioone.org/terms-of-use.

Usage of BioOne Complete content is strictly limited to personal, educational, and non - commercial use. Commercial inquiries or rights and permissions requests should be directed to the individual publisher as copyright holder.

BioOne sees sustainable scholarly publishing as an inherently collaborative enterprise connecting authors, nonprofit publishers, academic institutions, research libraries, and research funders in the common goal of maximizing access to critical research.

Comparative distribution of Syrian and great spotted woodpeckers in different landscapes of Poland

Lukasz KAJTOCH and Tomasz FIGARSKI*

Institute of Systematics and Evolution of Animals Polish Academy of Sciences, Sławkowska 17, 31-016 Kraków, Poland; e-mail: tomasz.figarski.isez@gmail.com

Received 1 September 2016; Accepted 30 March 2017

Abstract. Species often express some differences in habitat choice which enable their co-occurrence in sympatry and this phenomenon is particularly noticeable for related taxa and during range shifts. Here, co-distribution of two sibling woodpeckers (Syrian woodpecker *Dendrocopos syriacus* and great spotted woodpecker *Dendrocopos major*) in different types of urban, rural and riparian landscapes of Poland is presented. The Syrian woodpecker reached high densities in urban (city) landscape, but it was less common in town, rural and riparian areas, and everywhere it mostly occupied orchards and poplar and willow hedges. In contrast, the great spotted woodpecker was the dominant species in most areas, except city and everywhere was associated with forests or larger wooded areas (like parks). The Syrian woodpecker was dependent on the presence of softwood trees (poplars, willows), but it needed generally less than 40 % of wooded area in its territories, whereas the second species needed more than 70 %. The data presented here, together with information available from other areas in Central Europe, suggest that protection of Syrian woodpecker (species annexed in the European Union Bird Directive) should not be restricted to only rural landscapes but also needs to include its urban populations. Protection of this species should be focused on preservation of softwood tree hedges and woodlots and traditional orchards.

Key words: *Dendrocopos syriacus*, *Dendrocopos major*, Picidae, habitat requirements, urban birds

Introduction

Sibling species often express some differences in habitat choice which enable their co-occurrence in sympatry (Pianka 1981, Schoener 1982). The situation could be more complicated if formerly allo- or parapatric species start to occupy the same area due to expansion or range shift (Swihart et al. 2003). In such cases, habitat occupied by the local taxon could be invaded by its congener and finally, both species must divide environment and resources to co-exist, unless one of the species retreats due to direct or indirect competition (e.g. Berger & Gese 2007). There are many examples of species which have experienced such events. In Central Europe, an excellent example of sibling species co-occurrence caused by expansion of one of the siblings are woodpeckers: widespread great spotted woodpecker *Dendrocopos major* (Linnaeus, 1758) (hereafter, GW) and expanding Syrian woodpecker *Dendrocopos syriacus* (Hemprich & Ehrenberg, 1833) (hereafter, SW). The first species is native to Europe and is the most abundant woodpecker inhabiting the continent from the Mediterranean to boreal regions (Flade 1997,

BirdLife International 2004). The second woodpecker originally bred in the Middle East. By the end of the 19th century it had expanded to the Balkans and then, during the 20th century, it settled Central and Eastern Europe, reaching Austria to the west, Poland to the north and southern Russia to the east (Munteanu & Samwald 1997, Zavalov et al. 2008, Michalczuk 2014). There are many dissimilarities in biology and ecology of both species. GW is a generalist and breeds in various forests (both coniferous and deciduous), whereas SW is associated with forests only in its easternmost populations in Iran (Khanaposhtani et al. 2012). The latter species in majority of its range in the Middle East and the Balkans breeds in scattered woods and forest steppe, but in Central Europe it is mostly synanthropic breeding in man-made urban and rural woody vegetation (Szlivka 1957, Winkler 1972, Ciach & Fröhlich 2013, Michalczuk & Michalczuk 2016a). There is plenty of research describing the ecology of GW (Hansson 1992, Salvati et al. 2001, Mazgajski & Rejt 2006, Kosiński & Kempa 2007, Hebda 2009, Domokos & Cristea 2014), whereas similar studies for SW are scant and limited to only

* Corresponding Author

some types of landscapes and to only occurrence data (e.g. Szlivka 1957, Marisova & Butenko 1976, Bozsko & Juhász 1985, Mitjaj 1986, Mullerova-Franekova & Kocian 1995). There are almost no studies about this species' ecology and this deficiency of data has been highlighted in a review of European woodpeckers biology and ecology (Pasinelli 2006). Apart from some studies from the Middle East (Al-Safadi 2004, Aghanajafizadeh et al. 2011), there are exhaustive works from rural populations in eastern Poland (Michalczuk & Michalczuk 2016a, b) and rather preliminary works from urban populations in Slovakia (Mošanský & Mošanský 1999) and Poland (Ciach & Fröhlich 2013, Figarski 2014). It is known that SW also inhabits woody vegetation along river valleys, but knowledge about such populations is limited to only occurrence data (Kurek 1984, Grzybek & Kuziemko 2004, Michalczuk & Michalczuk 2011, Kajtoch 2012). Only some of these studies simultaneously presented data about both species, whereas such comparative studies are necessary as these woodpeckers hybridize in nature (Kroneisl-Rucner 1957, Gorman 1997, Dudzik & Polakowski 2011) and the level of this phenomenon is underestimated (Michalczuk et al. 2014). Therefore, interactions among particular pairs and whole local populations could be much more complex than expected which could have important implications for appropriate description of the niche of a species (see e.g. Morelli & Tryjanowski 2015). Moreover, woodpeckers have known value as indicators and keystone species for wooded areas (Mikusiński et al. 2001) and are proposed for monitoring of general biodiversity in forests (e.g. Drever et al. 2008). SW could be considered as appropriate species for such inventories and monitoring in urban and rural areas. The first aim of this study was to complement knowledge about urban, rural and riparian populations of SW on example of southern Poland in respect to their densities and general habitat requirements. The second goal was to compare relative abundance and general habitat composition within the territories of SW and GW living in sympatry in different landscape types. The practical aim of this research was to verify whether rural landscapes are crucial for the protection of this species as it results from designation of Special Protection Areas for this species in Natura 2000 network.

Material and Methods

Data from field inventories on four designed study plots in S Poland were collected. These plots were selected

arbitrarily in areas in which known populations of SW have been existing (Kajtoch 2012, 2017, Ciach & Fröhlich 2013). Each plot was situated in a different landscape (see details on landscape composition in Table 1). The first was localized in the southern part of the city of Krakow (hereafter Krakow; 12.5 km², center point 50.0205° N, 19.9963° E; inventoried in 2014) and covered all types of urban environments: tenement houses, housing estates, single-family houses and industrial areas, as well as different types of green urban areas with prevalent parks and cemeteries, avenues of trees along roads or railways and scattered orchards. The second encompassed the town of Wieliczka and its suburbs adjacent to Krakow (hereafter Wieliczka; 13 km², center point 49.9813° N, 20.0685° E; inventoried in 2015) which included all types of houses, but with a prevalence of single-family houses, and again all types of green urban areas with a prevalence of orchards, clusters of trees and avenues of trees along roads or railways. The third plot (rural) was localized seven kilometers south-east of Wieliczka on the Carpathian Foothills (hereafter Foothills; 24.5 km², center point 49.9481° N, 20.1223° E; inventoried in 2014). In that plot an agricultural landscape was prevalent, mainly villages with numerous orchards (about half of the plot area) and fields and meadows (about one third of the plot area). There were also several small deciduous and uneven-aged forests and woody vegetation areas of 10-50 ha area (in total 2.5 km²) dominated by either European hornbeam *Carpinus betulus* or oak *Quercus* spp. with small share of Scots pine *Pinus sylvestris*. The fourth plot (riparian) covered the middle part of the River Raba eight km south-east of the Foothills plot (hereafter Raba; 26 km², marginal points: 49.8856° N, 20.0928° E and 49.9737° N, 20.3300° E; inventoried in 2007). This plot included only the immediate vicinity of the river within the second fluvial terrace, which apart from the river channel was covered by meadows and locally riparian forests and wood hedges (dominated by poplar *Populus* spp. and willow *Salix* spp., approximately 33 % of the study area) and a very little number of buildings (villages placed 0.5-1 km from river banks, outside the studied plot).

Woodpeckers were surveyed according to standard count methods with the use of play-back stimulation (Michalczuk & Michalczuk 2006a, b, Dorresteijn et al. 2013). Calls and drumming of SW were used for broadcasting according to the following protocol: 2 min of calls, 3 min of listening, 2 min of drumming, 3 min of listening in each point.

Three counts per year (in March, April and May) were executed, which is enough for detection of most territories of SW (Michalczyk et al. 2011). In the Krakow and Wieliczka plots, play-back points were distributed systematically in networks, where points were located in nodes separated by a distance of 500 m. Additionally, birds were stimulated in each wooded area localized between these nodes to reduce probability of underestimation the number of territories in the plot. In the Foothills plot, play-back points were distributed to cover all woody vegetation types: forests, woodlots, orchards, tree-hedges and green urban areas (parks, cemeteries). In forests points were placed every 500-1000 m depending on topography and wood cover. Designation of play-back points in open areas (treeless fields and meadows) was omitted. In the Raba plot, play-back points were distributed along river banks every 500-1000 m (depending on topography and wood cover), except treeless parts of the valley. One check of each study area lasted 3-5 days, and each day observations lasted 5-6 hours. All counts were executed in good weather conditions (rainless and windless) during morning or evening hours. Observers moved between points on bikes and only in the Raba valley on foot. Observed woodpeckers or their hole nests were GPS marked and territories were identified from repeated observations of birds exhibiting mating or breeding behaviour (where woodpeckers were detected at least twice or where hole nest excavation or feeding of young birds was observed).

Woodpecker territories were assigned to the following categories of woody vegetation types: i) pine forests, ii) hornbeam & oak forests (broadleaf forests), iii) riparian forests, iv) willow and/or poplar hedges, v) midfield strips of trees, vi) green urban areas (parks and cemeteries), vii) orchards, based on the dominance of one of these woody vegetation types near the point (within a 100 m radius). The collection of environmental variables for analyzes was executed around play-backed points with the presence of woodpeckers (within a 100 m radius). Moreover, the approximate share of areas covered by woody vegetation (of any type) and, separately, the approximate share of all built-up areas were counted with the use of the orthophotomap available on <http://mapy.geoportal.gov.pl/imap/> GIS tool. Survey points with the presence of woodpeckers were also compared in respect to the prevalence of trees with soft/hardwood. In the first category were assigned all points where woody vegetation types iii, iv, v and vii were identified; the second category included types i, ii and vi.




Fig. 1. Relative shares of woodpecker territories found in selected types of woods in four examined plots in southern Poland. GW – great spotted woodpecker, SW – Syrian woodpecker.




Fig. 2. Coverage by built-up areas and wooded areas in territories of great spotted (GW) and Syrian (SW) woodpeckers in four examined plots in southern Poland.

Frequencies of survey points with the presence of woodpeckers in the above-mentioned woody vegetation

Table 1. Shares of land cover types in four studied plots (data from CORINE land cover – <http://clc.gios.gov.pl/>, adjusted and aggregated to actual state of landscapes on the basis of orthophotomaps <http://mapy.geoportal.gov.pl/imap/> and field observations).

CORINE code	Land cover type	Plot							
		Krakow		Wieliczka		Foothill		Raba	
		km ²	%	km ²	%	km ²	%	km ²	%
311, 313	Deciduous, mixed and riparian forests and woodlands	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	10.6	8.7	33.5
141, 222, 242	Orchards, gardens, parks, cemeteries and built-up areas (rural)	2.0	16.0	6.3	48.4	13.7	55.9	4.2	16.1
112	Built-up areas (urban)	7.7	61.6	5.3	40.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
121, 122	Industrial areas (factories, railways)	2.1	16.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
211, 231, 243	Fields, meadows, pastures	0.4	3.2	1.4	10.8	8.2	33.5	10.0	38.5
512	Water bodies	0.3	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	11.9
	Σ	12.5	100.0	13.0	100.0	24.5	100.0	26.0	100.0

Table 2. Number of territories and densities of great spotted (GW) and Syrian woodpeckers (SW) in four examined plots in southern Poland.

Plot	Krakow	Wieliczka	Foothills	Raba
Year	2014	2015	2014	2007
Area (km ²)	12.5	13.0	24.5	26.0
	territories (N)			
GW	4	10	18	19
SW	12	4	7	6
	densities (territories/1km ²)			
GW	0.32	0.77	0.73	0.73
SW	0.96	0.31	0.29	0.23

Table 3. Generalized linear mixed model (GLM) outputs distinguish survey points where Syrian woodpecker was observed from these where great spotted woodpecker was noted in terms of the total shares of woody vegetation (woods) and total shares of built-up areas (built-up areas).

Model statistics	Woods	Built-up areas	Woods × built-up areas
Estimate	0.089	0.004	−0.001
Wald statistic	6.831	0.005	0.144
P	0.009	0.944	0.703

types were compared between species for the same plot and also for all plots jointly with use of the Mann-Whitney test, and between plots for the same species with the use of Friedman ANOVA. Next, the total shares of woody vegetation and total shares of built-up areas at survey points were compared separately between species for the same plot and for all plots jointly with the use of Mann-Whitney test (two compared groups), and between plots for the same species with the use of Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA (more than two compared groups). Furthermore, generalized linear mixed model (GLM) with Poisson distribution was tested in order to check whether the total shares of woody vegetation and total shares of built-up areas distinguish survey points where SW was observed from these where GW was

noted. All statistical calculations were performed with Statistica 11.0 (Statsoft).

Results

GW was noted more often than SW in three out of the four examined plots and the ratio of GW/SW was 2.5 in Wieliczka, 2.6 in Foothills and 3.2 in Raba plots. Only in the Krakow plot was SW approximately three-times more often noted than GW. If woodpecker territories found in various types of forests were excluded (this concerned only GW), the GW/SW ratio would be lower in Foothills (1.4) and Raba (1.3). The densities of each species were similar in Wieliczka, Foothills and Raba plots. In the Krakow plot, the pattern was reversed. The exact numbers of territories and densities of both species are presented in Table 2. In general, GW bred in all types of woody vegetation, but it preferred hornbeam-oak and riparian forests (49.0 % of territories found in these types of woody vegetation) and parks/cemeteries (17.6 % territories), whereas SW preferred orchards (44.8 % territories), poplar/willow hedges (37.9 % territories) and also bred in parks/cemeteries (17.2 % territories) (Fig. 1). In the following types of landscapes (plots), both species occupied slightly different types of woody vegetation, but they settled interchangeably in woody vegetation of different types. In Krakow, both GW and SW preferred parks and cemeteries, but SW was most often noted in poplar-willow hedges or orchards. In Wieliczka, SW occupied only orchards, but GW was found in orchards, parks and cemeteries. In Foothills, SW again bred only in orchards, but GW was found mostly in forests. In Raba, SW occupied mostly poplar-willow hedges, whereas GW was most abundant in riparian forests (Fig. 1). These inter-specific differences in respect to wood choices were significant in Foothills, Raba and in joined data from all plots ($Z = -3.39, P \leq 0.001$; $Z = -2.83, P = 0.005$ and

$Z = -4.00$, $P < 0.001$; respectively) but insignificant for Krakow and Wieliczka ($Z = 0.00$, $P = 1.000$ and $Z = -1.41$, $P = 0.157$; respectively). On the other hand, when comparing woody vegetation choices for particular species between all four examined plots, the differences were insignificant (Chi^2 ANOVA = 1.50, $P = 0.68$ for GW and Chi^2 ANOVA = 1.73, $P = 0.63$ for SW).

As much as 54.9 % of GW territories were found in woody vegetation in which softwood trees dominated, whereas 45.1 % were in woody vegetation where hardwood trees prevailed. On the other hand, SW territories were most often (82.8 %) found in areas where trees with softwood prevailed and rarely (17.2 %) where hardwood trees were abundant. These differences between species were significant ($\text{Chi}^2 = 6.3$, $P = 0.01$).

Built-up area cover near play-backed points with the presence of woodpeckers was on average 3-fold higher for SW (average 30.5 %) than for GW (average 10.1 %) and in all plots the cover of built-up areas was higher for SW than for GW (Fig. 2). Conversely, wooded area cover was 2-fold lower for SW (average 38.6 %) than for GW (average = 72.2 %); and again, this pattern was consistent in all the examined types of landscapes (Fig. 2). General differences between species were significant both for built-up area cover ($Z = -4.83$, $P < 0.001$) and wooded area cover ($Z = 5.59$, $P < 0.001$). When considering only one landscape (plot), built-up area cover was significantly different between species for Krakow ($Z = -2.14$, $P = 0.032$) and Foothills ($Z = -3.25$, $P = 0.011$), but not for Wieliczka ($Z = -1.44$, $P = 0.151$) and Raba ($Z = -1.82$, $P = 0.069$). For wooded area cover there was no significant difference between species for Krakow ($Z = 0.99$, $P = 0.322$), but the difference was significant for Wieliczka ($Z = 2.05$, $P = 0.040$), Foothills ($Z = 3.08$, $P = 0.002$) and Raba ($Z = 2.84$, $P = 0.004$). When comparing covers between plots, the differences for GW were significant for built-up area cover (ANOVA $H = 35.06$, $P < 0.001$) and wooded area cover (ANOVA $H = 22.10$, $P < 0.001$) and for SW as well for built-up areas (ANOVA $H = 16.67$, $P < 0.001$) and wooded area cover (ANOVA $H = 12.55$, $P = 0.006$). According to the GLM, wooded area cover was the variable which clearly distinguished survey points with the presence of either SW or GW (Table 3).

Discussion

Woodpecker densities in mixed landscapes are difficult to compare due to high levels of differences in landscape composition between examined plots and

between areas presented in other studies. Moreover, such comparisons are violated by the varying sizes of areas in which woodpeckers were inventoried – most such studies have been performed on relatively small areas, e.g. a single park in a city or orchards in some villages, whereas studies covering whole cities or large rural landscapes are scarce. Densities of SW in the typical urban landscape (this study) are relatively low compared to densities found in other Central European cities; however, densities in these Slovakian and Hungarian cities were counted from small areas within parts of these cities (Sasvári 1981, Bozsko & Juhász 1985, Mullerova-Franekova & Kocian 1995, Mošanský & Mošanský 1999), where SW reached densities in ranges from 1 to even 17 territories/10 km². On the other hand, the density from the urban landscape (this study) is higher than those found in other similar studies (Fröhlich & Ciach 2013, Figarski 2014). The densities in town landscape (this study) were three-times lower than in urban area, but were similar to those calculated for adjacent rural and riparian landscapes. As similar densities (0.2-0.7 territories/1 km²) have also been found in other rural and rural/riparian landscapes of southern and eastern Poland (Grzybek & Kuziemko 2004, Michalczyk & Michalczyk 2011, 2016a, b), it could be assumed that in a mixed rural landscape one territory of SW corresponds to approximately 3 km² of rural landscape. Although the home range of a pair of SW covers a much smaller area if unsuitable habitats are excluded (e.g. open lands, continuous forests).

Estimated average coverage of wooded area in the plots where SW was observed was less than 40 % and this was smaller in the urban landscape of a large city (30 %) and higher in town, rural and riparian landscapes (38 %, 49 % and 45 %, respectively). SW is synanthropic, as it breeds in areas where built-up cover is approximately 1/3 of the area and in urban landscapes it can breed even if buildings cover more than 40 % of land, as in centers of cities and in multi-family housing estates. In such densely built-up areas, SW mostly breeds along tree hedges, in groups of softwood trees or locally in parks (Ciach & Fröhlich 2013, Figarski 2014). This study also confirms that SW is highly dependent on softwood trees such as poplars and willows in wood hedges or fruit trees in orchards, but it avoids areas where hardwood trees prevail (e.g. hornbeam and oak forests or parks where oaks and chestnuts dominate), unless such woody vegetation is used by woodpeckers in highly polluted areas like in large cities, where also hardwood trees are susceptible to decay (Ciach & Fröhlich 2013). This preference

of SW for softwood trees has been highlighted in many earlier studies not only from Poland and other European countries (Ciach & Fröhlich 2013, Figarski 2014, Michalczuk & Michalczuk 2016a), but also from its native range in the Middle East (Al-Safadi 2004, Aghanajafizadeh et al. 2011).

Habitat preferences directed the expansion of SW across Europe, where it has settled almost exclusively anthropogenic habitats such as orchards and green urban areas. The affinity of SW to the urbanized areas follows general finding that birds could benefit from living in cities where they find food resources and could be active over longer periods (e.g. due to light pollution, Ciach & Fröhlich 2016). The other factor which restricted its expansion was the presence of a closely related congener – GW. It is assumed that expansion of SW forced GW to leave urban and rural green areas, but this species remained dominant in forests (Cramp 1985, Munteanu & Samwald 1997, Michalczuk & Michalczuk 2016a). Indeed, this study showed an interesting pattern that both species express reverse relative abundances in different types of landscapes. SW is dominant in the urban landscape of a large city, but GW is more abundant in town, rural and riparian landscapes if forests are present. Domination of GW in town is an interesting phenomenon. This could be due to the well-developed tall vegetation and the vicinity of forests which could be source areas for GW population. In the town, SW maintained its population on the peripheries with dispersed vegetation and orchards – areas not suitable for GW. That is why the SW population in the town is related to rural populations and forms a smooth connection with them. The predominance of GW over SW in the rural landscape is inconsistent with the co-occurrence of these woodpeckers in rural landscapes of eastern Poland (Michalczuk & Michalczuk 2016a, b); however, in the latter forests constituted only 4 % of the total area, whereas in the former forests covered 10.6 %. Despite these differences, in both areas GW mostly settled forests, whereas SW was restricted to orchards. It is interesting that also in riparian landscape GW is much more numerous than SW. It is noteworthy that in the riparian plot SW was absent from poplar forests where softwood is abundant. Apparently, SW avoids compact woody vegetation, regardless of which tree species is dominant, but it is also probable that the high density of GW in riparian forests prevents SW from breeding there. In the riparian landscape of the Raba plot, SW was mostly found in willow hedges on the verge of the valley. Some of these territories included orchards located close to, but above the valley. Also,

in other river valleys of southern and eastern Poland, SW was found either in willow hedges or in orchards surrounding the valley (Kurek 1984, Grzybek & Kuziemko 2004, Michalczuk & Michalczuk 2011). It was shown that species richness and abundance of woodpeckers correlated positively to woodland patch area and negatively to increasing urbanization (Myczko et al. 2014) and apparently SW is the only species which break out of this pattern.

The results of this study show that protection of SW should not be only focused on its rural populations. In Poland, several Natura 2000 sites have been designed for the protection of SW, but all of them are localized in rural or rural-riparian landscapes. These sites almost exclusively protect populations breeding in orchards and only rarely in willow woods (Wilk et al. 2010, <http://obszary.natura2000.pl/>). No Special Protection Area has been defined for SW in any Polish city, while this study and previous articles (Luniak et al. 2001, Ciach & Fröhlich 2013, Figarski 2014) support the statement that urban populations of SW could be one of most numerous (with higher densities). In spite of that, these crucial urban populations of SW are not protected (except of species protection under Polish law). Protection of SW (and other woodpeckers) in cities would be much more difficult due to mixed land coverage, where woody vegetation is scarce and fragmented, and there is complex ownership. There should be implemented some regulations which prevent removal of trees in urban areas. In areas under municipal administration removal of trees (especially poplars and willows) should be restricted only to places where it is necessary due to public safety. In private lands, which concern mainly orchards, some regulations should be implemented to encourage owners (also financially) to maintain old fruit trees and plant new ones (see Kajtoch 2017). Regardless of these issues, protection of SW is of immediate importance as recent data suggest a substantial decrease in its number in rural populations (Michalczuk & Michalczuk 2015). Also, urban populations are in danger due to intensive works in green urban areas, during which especially softwood trees (poplars, willows, fruit trees) are cut out mainly to enable private investments or during meaningless care of green urban areas. Protection via the attribution of Natura 2000 site status for some SW urban populations could bring new tools for regulation of artificial vegetated areas management in cities. Finally, SW should be considered as keystone species for woody vegetation in urban and rural areas, as protection of its sites would lead to preserving of trees and associated biodiversity.

Literature

- Aghanajafzadeh A., Heydari F., Naderi G. & Hemami M.R. 2011: Nesting hole site selection by the Syrian woodpecker, *Dendrocopos syriacus*, in Yazad province, Iran. *Zool. Middle East* 53: 3–6.
- Al-Safadi M.M. 2004: On the breeding biology of the Syrian woodpecker, *Dendrocopos syriacus*, in the Gaza Strip. *Zool. Middle East* 32: 7–12.
- Berger K.M. & Gese E.M. 2007: Does interference competition with wolves limit the distribution and abundance of coyotes? *J. Anim. Ecol.* 76: 1075–1085.
- BirdLife International 2004: Birds in Europe: population estimates, trends and conservation status. *BirdLife International, Conservation Series No. 12, Cambridge*.
- Bozsko Sz. & Juhász L. 1985: The bird fauna of Debrecen and its changes during this century. *A Debreceni Déri Múzeum Évkönyve*: 17–51. (in Hungarian)
- Ciach M. & Fröhlich A. 2013: Habitat preferences of the Syrian woodpecker *Dendrocopos syriacus* in urban environments: an ambiguous effect of pollution. *Bird Study* 60: 491–499.
- Ciach M. & Fröhlich A. 2016: Habitat type, food resources, noise and light pollution explain the species composition, abundance and stability of a winter bird assemblage in an urban environment. *Urban Ecosyst.* doi: 10.1007/s11252-016-0613-6.
- Cramp S. (ed.) 1985: The birds of the Western Palearctic, 4. *Oxford University Press, Oxford*.
- Domokos E. & Cristea V. 2014: Effects of managed forests structure on woodpeckers (Picidae) in the Niraj valley (Romania). *North-West. J. Zool.* 10: 110–117.
- Dorresteijn I., Hartel T., Hanspach J. et al. 2013: The conservation value of traditional rural landscapes: the case of woodpeckers in Transylvania, Romania. *PLoS ONE* 8: e65236.
- Drever M.C., Aitken K.E., Norris A.R. & Martin K. 2008: Woodpeckers as reliable indicators of bird richness, forest health and harvest. *Biol. Conserv.* 141: 624–634.
- Dudzik K. & Polakowski M. 2011: The cases of mixed broods and identification of Syrian woodpecker *Dendrocopos syriacus* and great spotted woodpecker *Dendrocopos major* hybrids in Poland. *Chrońmy Przyr. Ojcz.* 67: 254–260. (in Polish with English summary)
- Figarski T. 2014: Habitat characteristics of the Syrian woodpecker *Dendrocopos syriacus* in the city of Radom, Poland – preliminary results. In: Indykiewicz P. & Böhner J. (eds.), Urban fauna. Animal, man, and the city – interactions and relationships. *University of Science and Technology, Bydgoszcz*: 225–234.
- Flade M. 1997: *Dendrocopos major* great spotted woodpecker. In: Hagemeyer W.J.M. & Blair M.J. (eds.), The EBCC atlas of European breeding birds: their distribution and abundance. *Academic Press, London, U.K.*: 448–449.
- Fröhlich A. & Ciach M. 2013: Distribution and abundance of the Syrian woodpecker *Dendrocopos syriacus* in Kraków. *Ornis Pol.* 54: 237–246. (in Polish with English summary)
- Gorman G. 1997: Hybridisation by Syrian woodpeckers. *Br. Birds* 90: 578.
- Grzybek J. & Kuziemko M. 2004: Birds of the lower San River Valley. *Ptaki Podkarpacia* 10: 1–24. (in Polish with English abstract)
- Hansson L. 1992: Requirements by the great spotted woodpecker *Dendrocopos major* for a suburban life. *Ornis Svec.* 2: 1–6.
- Hebda G. 2009: Nesting sites of the great spotted woodpecker *Dendrocopos major* L. in Poland: analysis of nest cards. *Pol. J. Ecol.* 57: 149–158. (in Polish with English summary)
- Kajtoch Ł. 2012: The importance of the Carpathian river valleys for breeding birds: the example of the Stradomka and Łososina drainage areas. *Chrońmy Przyr. Ojcz.* 68: 3–12. (in Polish with English summary)
- Kajtoch Ł. 2017: The importance of traditional orchards for breeding birds: the preliminary study on Central European example. *Acta Oecol.* 78: 53–60.
- Khanaposhtani M.G., Kaboli M., Karami M. & Etemad V. 2012: Effect of habitat complexity on richness, abundance and distributional pattern of forest birds. *Environ. Manage.* 50: 296–303.
- Kosiński Z. & Kempa M. 2007: Density, distribution and nest-sites of woodpeckers Picidae, in a managed forest of Western Poland. *Pol. J. Ecol.* 53: 519–533.
- Kroneisl-Ruchner R. 1957: Der Blutspecht, *Dendrocopos syriacus*, in Kroatien und die Frage seiner Bastardierung mit dem Buntspecht, *Dendrocopos major*. *Larus* 9–10: 34–47.
- Kurek H. 1984: Syrian woodpecker *Dendrocopos syriacus* in the San River Valley. *Not. Ornitol.* 25: 65–68. (in Polish with English summary)
- Luniak M., Kozłowski P., Nowicki W. & Plit J. 2001: Birds of Warsaw in 1962–2000. *IGiPZ PAN, Warszawa*. (in Polish with English summary)
- Marisova I.V. & Butenko A.G. 1976: Data on distribution and ecology of Syrian woodpecker *Dendrocopos syriacus* in the Ukraine. *Vestn. Zool.* 2: 29–34. (in Russian)
- Mazgajski T.D. & Rejt Ł. 2006: The effect of forest patch size on the breeding biology of the great spotted woodpecker *Dendrocopos major*. *Ann. Zool. Fenn.* 43: 211–220.
- Michalczuk J. 2014: Expansion of the Syrian woodpecker *Dendrocopos syriacus* in Europe and Western Asia. *Ornis Pol.* 55: 149–161. (in Polish with English summary)
- Michalczuk J., McDevitt A.D., Mazgajski T.D. et al. 2014: Tests of multiple molecular markers for the identification of great spotted and Syrian woodpeckers and their hybrids. *J. Ornithol.* 155: 591–600.
- Michalczuk J. & Michalczuk M. 2006a: Reaction on playback and density estimations of Syrian woodpecker *Dendrocopos syriacus* in agricultural areas of SE Poland. *Acta Ornithol.* 41: 33–39.
- Michalczuk J. & Michalczuk M. 2006b: The usefulness of the mapping method with playback in estimation of the numbers of the Syrian woodpecker *Dendrocopos syriacus*. *Not. Ornitol.* 47: 175–184. (in Polish with English summary)

- Michalczuk J. & Michalczuk M. 2011: Syrian woodpecker *Dendrocopos syriacus* in the Upper Huczwa River Watershed in 2004–2006. *Chrońmy Przyr. Ojcz.* 67: 426–432. (in Polish with English summary)
- Michalczuk J. & Michalczuk M. 2015: Decline of the Syrian woodpecker *Dendrocopos syriacus* population in rural landscape in SE Poland in 2004–2012. *Ornis Pol.* 2: 67–75. (in Polish with English summary)
- Michalczuk J. & Michalczuk M. 2016a: Habitat preferences of Picidae woodpeckers in the agricultural landscape of SE Poland: is the Syrian woodpecker *Dendrocopos syriacus* colonizing a vacant ecological niche? *North-West. J. Zool.* 12: 14–21.
- Michalczuk J. & Michalczuk M. 2016b: Coexistence of Syrian woodpecker *Dendrocopos syriacus* and great spotted woodpecker *Dendrocopos major* in nonforest tree stands of the agricultural landscape in SE Poland. *Turk. J. Zool.* 40: 743–748.
- Michalczuk J., Michalczuk M. & Cymbała R. 2011: The usefulness of various methods of monitoring the population size of the Syrian woodpecker *Dendrocopos syriacus*. *Ornis Pol.* 52: 280–287. (in Polish with English summary)
- Mikusinski G., Gromadzki M. & Chylarecki P. 2001: Woodpeckers as indicators of forest bird diversity. *Conserv. Biol.* 15: 208–217.
- Mit'aj I.S. 1986: Syrian woodpecker in the forest-steppe in Pridneprovsky Land. Birds distribution in USSR, conservation and rational management. *Akademija Nauk SSSR, Leningrad, USSR*: 70–71. (in Russian)
- Morelli F. & Tryjanowski P. 2015: No species is an island: testing the effects of biotic interactions on models of avian niche occupation. *Ecol. Evol.* 5: 759–768.
- Mošanský L. & Mošanský A. 1999: Development of Syrian woodpecker (*Dendrocopos syriacus*) and great spotted woodpecker (*Dendrocopos major*) population in Košice urban area. *Tichodroma* 12 (Suppl. 1): 97–106.
- Mullerova-Franekova M. & Kocian L. 1995: Structure and dynamics of breeding bird communities in three parks in Bratislava. *Folia Zool.* 44: 111–121.
- Munteanu D. & Samwald O. 1997: *Dendrocopos syriacus* Syrian woodpecker. In: Hagemeijer W.J.M. & Blair M.J. (eds.), The EBCC atlas of European breeding birds: their distribution and abundance. *Academic Press, London, U.K.*: 450–451.
- Myczko Ł., Rosin Z.M., Skórka P. & Tryjanowski P. 2014: Urbanization level and woodland size are major drivers of woodpecker species richness and abundance. *PLoS ONE* 9: e94218.
- Pasinelli G. 2006: Population biology of European woodpecker species: a review. *Ann. Zool. Fenn.* 43: 96–111.
- Pianka E.R. 1981: Resource acquisition and allocation among animals. In: Townsend C. & Calow P. (eds.), *Physiological ecology: an evolutionary approach to resource use*. *Sinauer Associates, Sunderland*: 300–304.
- Salvati L., Manganaro A. & Ranazzi L. 2001: Wood occupation and area requirement of the great spotted woodpecker *Picoides major* in Rome (Central Italy). *Acta Ornithol.* 36: 19–23.
- Sasvári L. 1981: Birds communities in the parks and squares of Budapest. *Opusc. Zool.* 17–18: 121–143.
- Schoener T.W. 1982: The controversy over interspecific competition. *Am. Sci.* 70: 586–595.
- Swihart R.K., Gehring T.M., Kolozsvary M.B. & Nupp T.E. 2003: Responses of “resistant” vertebrates to habitat loss and fragmentation: the importance of niche breadth and range boundaries. *Divers. Distrib.* 9: 1–18.
- Szlivka L. 1957: Von der Biologie des Blutspechts *Dendrocopos syriacus balcanicus*, und seinen Beziehungen zu den Staren *Sturnus vulgaris*. *Larus* 9–10: 48–70.
- Wilk T., Jujka M., Krogulec J. & Chylarecki P. (eds.) 2010: Important bird areas of international importance in Poland. *OTOP, Marki*. (in Polish with English summary)
- Winkler H. 1972: Beiträge zur Ethologie des Blutspechts (*Dendrocopos syriacus*). Das nicht-reproduktive Verhalten. *Z. Tierpsychol.* 31: 300–325.
- Zavialov E., Tabachishin V.G. & Mosolova E.Y. 2008: Expansion of Syrian woodpecker in European Russia and Ukraine. *Dutch Birding* 30: 236–238.