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## I. GENERAL

A. Weather Conditions.

No official weather data is available for the Burford Lake Area. This summer's period has been rather dry, in view of last year's "wet" summer. The numerous summer showers failed to materialize this year. Temperatures followed the normal warm pattern.
B. Habitat Conditions.

1. Water.

Both Burford and Hayden Lakes held good water levels throughout the period. The normal summer evaporation loss did cause a drop in the lake levels by the end of the period.
2. Food and Cover.

Heavy growths of submerged aquatics were produced in both lakes, largely Sago and Horned Pondweeds. The growth of aquatics, submerged and emergents, was not quite as abundant as the year before. The hard winter and cool spring period probably account for this decrease in aquati production. Good stands of Bulrush were established nearly all the way around Burford Lake. Hayden Lake's normally dense stands were just making a comeback after being worked over by the hard winter and ice action.
II. WILDLIFE
A. Migratory Birds.

The summer build-up of waterfowl on the lakes followed fairly close to the normal pattern this year. During May, approximately 900 ducks and 2,500 Coot were utilizing the natural foods of both lakes. Toward the end of June a slight decrease in numbers was observed with a further decrease being noted during July. This was not the normal pattern of a slow buildup. This unusual decrease caused the cooperative banding program of State and Fish and Wildlife personnel to be canceled this year. The populations were estimated at the end of July, to be 500 ducks and 1,000 Coot. By the end of the period, duck numbers were up to about 800 and Coot numbers jumped
to about 5,000. A percentage breakdown on the populations at the end of the period follows: 75\% Coot, $5 \%$ Mallard, $6 \%$ Gadwall, 4\% Widgeon, 3\% Pintail, 7\% Redhead, Ruddy, Shoveller and Greenwing, Bluewing, Cinnamon Teal.

Waterfowl production again failed to materialize on the area. Nesting cover around the margins appeared sufficient. Coot production was good as evidenced by the many broods observed. Also, a few Ruddy and Grebe broods were seen.

Other water and shorebirds utilizing the area in small numbers were the Avocet, Killdeer, Black-crowned Night Heron, Herring Gull and Spotted Sandpiper.

Mourning Dove numbers were about normal for the lake area, a few.
B. Upland Game Birds.

None observed during this period.
C. Big Game Animals.

The lakes continued to draw many deer, from the surrounding hillsides, to water.
D. Fur Animals, Predators, Rodents and Others.

Muskrats continued to use the lakes and appeared to be on the increase.

Cottontails and Jackrabbits were seen on occasions in the surrounding safe brush, but numbers remain low.

The one beaver family continued to homestead the small area of Burford Lake on the east side.
E. Hawks, Eagles, Owls, Crows, Ravens and Magpies.

No eagles or owls were observed in the area this period. Redtailed, Marsh and Sparrow Hawks continued to visit the area off and on, in very small numbers. Crows, Ravens and Magpies were observed in few numbers also, which is normal for the lake area.
F. Fish.

Fish are not present in the lakes, except for a few minnows.
G. Reptiles.

One Bullsnake was observed in all of the visits to the area.
H. Diseases.

None to report on this period.
III. REFUGE DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE
A. Physical Development and Maintenance.

No maintenance was attempted this period. Fence repair and water-gap construction is scheduled for the next period, if water conditions are favorable.
B., C., D., E., and F.

These are not applicable to this area.
IV. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
A. Grazing.

Light grazing with 70 A.U.M.'s is permitted from the 15 th of August and through the next seven months. Approximately 30 head were grazing the fenced area at the end of the period.
B. Haying.

None permitted within the fenced area.
C. Hunting.

None permitted this period.
D. Other Uses.

This does not apply to this area.

## V. FIELD INVESTIGATION UR APPLIED RESEARCH

A. Banding Operations.

No banding was attempted this summer, as a sufficient number of ducks was not present.
B. Photographs.

Sorry, none this period.
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Dated: September 7, 1962
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MONTHS OF $\qquad$ TO $\qquad$ 1962


Int. Nup. Sec.,
manh $n$ n
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ TO August , 1962

| $\begin{gathered} \text { (1) } \\ \text { Species } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & : 7 / 1-14 \\ & : \quad 11 \end{aligned}$ | Weeks of repor |  |  | 1 ng $15-11$ 15 | per $12-18$ 16 | $\frac{d}{19-25}$ | $\begin{array}{r} : \\ \hline 8 / 26-31: \\ 18: \end{array}$ | (3) Estimated waterfowl days use | ```:(4)``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Swans: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trumpeter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Geese: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cackling |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White-fronted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Snow |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Blue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mallard | 150 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 550 | 25,550 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pintail | 50 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 50 | 9,450 |  |  |
| Green-winged teal | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 870 |  |  |
| Blue-winged teal Cinnamon teal | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 1,245 |  |  |
|  | 10 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 1,735 |  |  |
| Shoveler         <br> Wood 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 20 | 3,570 |  |  |
| Ring-necked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Canvasback |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scaup |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,700 |  |  |
| Bufflehead |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ruddy | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 4 | 1,840 | 3 | 25 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coot: |  | 3,200 | 3,200 | 3,200 | 3,200 | 3,200 | 3,200 | 19,150 | 394,950 | 15 | 85 |
|  | 1,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | Total Days Use : | (6)(7) <br> Peak Number $: ~ T o t a l ~ P r o d u c t i o n ~$ | SUMMARI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Swans |  |  | Principal feeding areas Both lakes. |
| Geese |  | : |  |
| Ducks | 95,320 | 1,024: 25 | Principal nesting areas Bulrush stands. |
| Coots | 394,950 | 19,150: 85 |  |
|  |  |  | Reported by Robert C. Brown |
|  | INST | RUCTIONS (See Secs. 7531 through | 7534, Wildlife Refuges Field Manual) |
| (1) s | Species: | In addition to the birds listed reporting period should be adde to those species of local and n | on form, other species occurring on refuge during the in appropriate spaces. Special attention should be given ional significance. |
| (2) W | Weeks of Reporting Period: | Estimated average refuge popula | ons. |
| (3) | Estimated Waterfowl Days Use: | Average weekly populations x nu | ber of days present for each species. |
| (4) P | Production: | Estimated number of young produ breeding areas. Brood counts sh breeding habitat. Estimates ha | d based on observations and actual counts on representative uld be made on two or more areas aggregating $10 \%$ of the ng no basis in fact should be omitted. |
| (5) $T$ | Total Days Use: | A summary of data recorded under | (3). |
| (6) P | Peak Number: | Maximum number of waterfowl pres | nt on refuge during any census of reporting period. |
| (7) T | Total Production: | A summary of data recorded under | (4). |

Interior Duplicating Section, Washington, D. C. 1953
to August $199^{2}$


(1) Species:
(2) First Seen:

The first refuge record for the species for the season concerned.
(3) Peak Numbers: The greatest number of the species present in a limited interval of time.
(4) Last Seen:
(5) Production:
(6) Total:

INSTRUCTIONS
Use the correct names as found in the A.O.U. Checklist, 1931 Edition, and list group in A.O.U. order. Avoid general terms as "seagull", "tern", etc. In addition to the birds listed on form, other species occurring on refuge during the reporting period should be added in appropriate spaces. Special attention should be given to those species of local and National
significance. Groups: I. Water and Marsh Birds (Gaviiformes to Ciconiiformes and Gruiiformes)
II. Shorebirds, Gulls and Terns (Charadriiformes)
III. Doves and Pigeons (Columbiformes)
IV. Predaceous Birds (Falconiformes, Strigiformes and predaceous

Passeriformes)

The last refuge record for the species during the season concerned.
Estimated number of young produced based on observations and actual counts.
Estimated total number of the species using the refuge during the period concerned.
INT.-DUP. SEC., WASH., D.C.

