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Abstract


We defined habitat requirements (source habitats) and assessed trends in these habitats for 91 species of terrestrial vertebrates on 58 million ha (145 million acres) of public and private lands within the interior Columbia basin (hereafter referred to as the basin). We also summarized knowledge about species-road relations for each species and mapped source habitats in relation to road densities for four species of terrestrial carnivores. Our assessment was conducted as part of the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP), a multiresource, multidisciplinary effort by the USDA Forest Service (FS) and the USDI Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to develop an ecosystem-based strategy for managing FS and BLM lands within the basin. Our assessment was designed to provide technical support for the ICBEMP and was done in five steps. First, we identified species of terrestrial vertebrates for which there was ongoing concern about population or habitat status (species of focus), and for which habitats could be estimated reliably by using a large mapping unit (pixel size) of 100 ha (247 acres) and broad-scale methods of spatial analysis. Second, we evaluated change in source habitats from early European settlement (historical, circa 1850 to 1890) to current (circa 1985 to 1995) conditions for each species and for hierarchically nested groups of species and families of groups at the spatial scales of the watershed (5th hydrologic unit code [HUC]), subbasin (4th HUC), ecological reporting unit, and basin. Third, we summarized the effects of roads and road-associated factors on populations and habitats for each of the 91 species and described the results in relation to broad-scale patterns of road density. Fourth, we mapped classes of the current abundance of source habitats for four species of terrestrial carnivores in relation to classes of road density across the 164 subbasins and used the maps to identify areas having high potential to support persistent populations. And fifth, we used our results, along with results from other studies, to describe broad-scale implications for managing habitats deemed to have undergone long-term decline and for managing species negatively affected by roads or road-associated factors.

Our results indicated that habitats for species, groups, and families associated with old-forest structural stages, with native grasslands, or with native shrublands have undergone strong, widespread decline. Implications of these results for managing old-forest structural stages include consideration of (1) conservation of habitats in subbasins and watersheds where decline in old forests has been strongest; (2) silvicultural manipulations of mid-seral forests to accelerate development of late-seral stages; and (3) long-term silvicultural manipulations and long-term accommodation of fire and other disturbance regimes in all forested structural stages to hasten development and improvement in the amount, quality, and distribution of old-forest stages. Implications of our results for managing rangelands include the potential to (1) conserve native grasslands and shrublands that have not undergone large-scale reduction in composition of native plants; (2) control or eradicate exotic plants on native grasslands and shrublands where invasion potential or spread of exotics is highest; and (3) restore native plant communities by using intensive range practices where potential for restoration is highest.

Our analysis also indicated that >70 percent of the 91 species are affected negatively by one or more factors associated with roads. Moreover, maps of the abundance of source habitats in relation to classes of road density suggested that road-associated factors hypothetically may reduce the potential to support persistent populations of terrestrial carnivores in many subbasins. Management implications of our summarized road effects include the
potential to mitigate a diverse set of negative factors associated with roads. Comprehensive mitigation of road-associated factors would require a substantial reduction in the density of existing roads as well as effective control of road access in relation to management of livestock, timber, recreation, hunting, trapping, mineral development, and other human activities.

A major assumption of our work was that validation research will be conducted by agency scientists and other researchers to corroborate our findings. As a preliminary step in the process of validation, we found high agreement between trends in source habitats and prior trends in habitat outcomes that were estimated as part of the habitat outcome analysis for terrestrial species within the basin. Results of our assessment also were assumed to lead to finer scale evaluations of habitats for some species, groups, or families as part of implementation procedures. Implementation procedures are necessary to relate our findings to local conditions; this would enable managers to effectively apply local conservation and restoration practices to support broad-scale conservation and restoration strategies that may evolve from our findings.

Keywords: Cluster analysis, conservation, forest management, habitat, habitat condition, habitat management, habitat trend, interior Columbia basin, Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project, landscape ecology, landscape analysis, population viability, rangeland management, terrestrial vertebrates, spatial analysis, species of focus, sink, sink environment, source, source environment, source habitat, source habitats, restoration, species groups, monitoring, validation research, viability, wildlife, wildlife-habitat relations.
Foreword

This publication consists of three volumes so that our findings—which consist of hundreds of tables, figures, pages of text, and supporting citations—could be presented in a manner most usable to resource managers, biologists, and the public. Volume 1 is designed as an overview of objectives, methods, key results, and management implications. Volumes 2 and 3 contain increasingly detailed results that support and complement results in volume 1. We believe that resource managers may find sufficient detail in the generalized results and implications presented in volume 1, but that management biologists and other users of the results and supporting data will want to refer to all three volumes. Results, management implications, and supporting citations provided in volume 2 are especially important to consider as part of step-down implementation procedures and related management conducted by field units within the interior Columbia basin. By contrast, information in volume 1 may be particularly useful in serving broad-scale planning issues, objectives, and strategies for the interior Columbia basin as a whole. Regardless of application, all three volumes are intended to function together as a comprehensive assessment of habitat trends and a summary of other environmental factors affecting terrestrial vertebrates whose population or habitat status is of ongoing concern to resource managers. Data underlying most tables presented in the three volumes also are available at the website for the ICBEMP: http://www.icbemp.gov/spatial/metadata/databases.
Preface

The Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project was initiated by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to respond to several critical issues including, but not limited to, forest and rangeland health, anadromous fish concerns, terrestrial species viability concerns, and the recent decline in traditional commodity flows. The charter given to the project was to develop a scientifically sound, ecosystem-based strategy for managing the lands of the interior Columbia River basin administered by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. The Science Integration Team was organized to develop a framework for ecosystem management, an assessment of the socioeconomic and biophysical systems in the basin, and an evaluation of alternative management strategies. This paper is one in a series of papers developed as background material for the framework, assessment, or evaluation of alternatives. It provides more detail than was possible to disclose directly in the primary documents.

The Science Integration Team, although organized functionally, worked hard at integrating the approaches, analyses, and conclusions. It is the collective effort of team members that provides depth and understanding to the work of the project. The Science Integration Team leadership included deputy team leaders Russell Graham and Sylvia Arbelbide; landscape ecology—Wendel Hann, Paul Hessburg, and Mark Jensen; aquatic—Jim Sedell, Kris Lee, Danny Lee, Jack Williams, and Lynn Decker; economic—Richard Haynes, Amy Horne, and Nick Reyna; social science—Jim Burchfield, Steve McCool, Jon Bumstead, and Stewart Allen; terrestrial—Bruce Marcot, Kurt Nelson, John Lehmkuhl, Richard Holthausen, Randy Hickenbottom, Marty Raphael, and Michael Wisdom; spatial analysis—Becky Gravenmier, John Steffenson, and Andy Wilson.

Thomas M. Quigley
Editor
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Introduction

This volume is the second in a three-volume publication that defines and assesses trends in source habitats for 91 terrestrial vertebrate species within the interior Columbia River basin (hereafter referred to as “basin”) (See “Glossary,” vol. 3, for terms used in this paper). This assessment was conducted as part of the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP), a multiresource, multidisciplinary effort by the USDA Forest Service (FS) and the USDI Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to develop an ecosystem-based strategy for managing lands within the basin administered by the FS and BLM. The assessment area extends over 58 million ha1 (145 million acres) in eastern Washington, eastern Oregon, Idaho, western Montana, and small portions of Nevada, California, Wyoming, and Utah (figs. 1 and 2). The purpose of this publication is to provide technical support to the ICBEMP regarding trends in the areal extent of wildlife habitats in the basin, as well as management implications regarding those trends. Additionally, it can be used to provide a broad-scale view of how wildlife habitats have changed in the basin since early European settlement and factors that have contributed to those changes.

This publication focuses on source habitats rather than all habitats in which a species is known to occur. Source habitats are those characteristics of macrovegetation that contribute to stationary or positive population growth for a species in a specified area and time. Source habitats contribute to source environments (Pulliam 1988, Pulliam and Danielson 1991), which represent the composite of all environmental conditions that results in stationary or positive population growth for a species in a specified area and time. The distinction between source habitats and source environments is important for understanding our evaluation and its limitations. For example, source habitats for a bird species during the breeding season would include those characteristics of vegetation that contribute to successful nesting and rearing of young, but would not include nonvegetative factors, such as the effects of pesticides on thinning of eggshells, which also affect production of young. Consequently, we have tried to identify all factors that affect population performance of each species as a complement to our explicit analysis of source habitats. For our analysis, we relied on published literature and guidance from species experts to identify source habitats and additional factors that presumably affect population performance.

The 91 species in our analysis are organized into 40 groups, 37 of which are then organized into 12 families. Groups are composed of one or more species that share common source habitats, as defined by vegetation cover types and structural stages. Similar groups also are clustered into families whose source habitats generally fall into similar terrestrial community groups, a broader classification that includes several cover types. Group size ranges from 1 to 17 species, and family size ranges from one to nine groups.

Volume 1 describes methods used to select species for analysis, place them in groups and families, estimate source habitats, and analyze habitat trends. It also includes general analyses of source habitat trends at all three levels—species, group, and family—including a correlation analysis that evaluates how well species-level trends in source habitats are reflected in the higher level group- and family-level trends. Volume 1 also identifies causes for the observed trends and ecological processes important for maintaining source habitats as part of the family-level results. Additionally, volume 1 provides a special section on species and groups that are negatively affected by road-related human activities. In volume 2, we present more detailed results on the analysis of source habitat trends at the group level in support of the more generalized results presented in volume 1. The appendices in volume 3 provide further data and results in support of both volumes 1 and 2.

For each of the 40 groups discussed in volume 2, we specifically present results on source habitat trends, interpret those results, and discuss management implications. In the results section, we list the species included in each group, display range maps for each of the species, and describe source habitats and special habitat features for each species. Source habitats

---

1 See “Abbreviations,” p. 396, for definitions of abbreviated units of measure.
Figure 1—Assessment boundaries of the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project and the 13 ecological reporting units.
Figure 2—Land ownership within the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project science assessment area.
and special habitat features for each species in each group and family are listed in volume 3, appendix 1, tables 1 and 2.

In the results section of volume 2, we specifically display maps that compare the historical and current distribution of source habitats within the basin for each group, and describe changes in areal extent that were projected to have occurred since the historical period. These changes are analyzed at the watershed level, a unit of land whose mean size is about 22 500 ha (56,000 acres). The watershed results are summarized by ecological reporting units (ERUs), which represent 13 broad geographical regions within the basin (fig. 1) that differ significantly in biophysical characteristics (Hann and others 1997).

The section on interpretation of results in volume 2 consists of four components. First, we provide a description of the vegetation changes that underlie source habitat changes. Ecological processes and management actions that caused the vegetation changes are described in volume 1, and more thoroughly in Hann and others (1997). Second, changes from historical to current in the condition of special habitat features are disclosed for those features for which information is available. Third, factors other than habitat that significantly affect species in the group are discussed, with emphasis on the effects of specific management activities and other human disturbances. Finally, any available data on population status and trends for any species in the group are presented. We have not performed any correlations or added discussion of anecdotal similarity between habitat trends and population trends because our habitat analysis addresses different time frames and different geographic areas than do population trend data available for most species.

The final section of volume 2 discusses management implications based on both the findings of this analysis and published literature for each group of species. Management implications are presented in three parts. First, issues relevant to species in the group are discussed. These include issues related to broad-scale source habitats, special habitat features, and other factors that significantly influence the group. Broad strategies that could be used to resolve these issues are presented, and geographic priorities for the strategies are offered where appropriate. The third part of the management implications section consists of specific on-the-ground management practices that could be used in the implementation of the strategies. In all cases, the discussion of strategies and practices is intended to be addressed within the context of broader ecosystem-based objectives. Implementation of the strategies and practices for any single group without consideration of other ecosystem elements would not be appropriate.

The list of strategies and practices outlined for each group of species in volume 2 should be considered a menu of possible approaches that could be adopted by managers to help achieve their objectives for conservation and restoration of habitats. Before any of these approaches are adopted, they should be analyzed to determine their effectiveness, their compatibility with overall ecosystem management objectives, and their applicability to specific situations. Testing and validation should continue through all the geographic scales of implementation.

In summary, the strategies presented at the family level in volume 1 represent a synthesis of similar group strategies developed in volume 2. Volume 1 therefore provides a broader, more generalized perspective of source habitat trends in the basin, whereas volume 2 offers a more specific, indepth coverage of the same analysis. Thus, users of our publication can refer to volume 1 for an overview of results and implications, refer to volume 2 for detailed results that support the overview, and refer to volume 3 for the most specific results and information in support of both volumes 1 and 2.
Group 1—Pygmy Nuthatch, White-Breasted Nuthatch, and White-Headed Woodpecker

Results

Species ranges, source habitats, and special habitat features—Group 1 consists of the pygmy nuthatch, white-breasted nuthatch, and white-headed woodpecker, all of which are year-round residents within the basin. The pygmy nuthatch is widespread except for the Columbia Plateau and southern portions of the basin, and the white-breasted nuthatch occurs throughout most of the basin (fig. 3). The white-headed woodpecker has the most restricted range, occurring in the eastern slope of the Cascade Range, the Blue Mountains, the Okanogan Mountains, and mountains of Idaho. Source habitats for group 1 are found in old forests of Sierra Nevada mixed-conifer and ponderosa pine cover types. The white-breasted nuthatch also breeds in old forests of aspen and cottonwood-willow, in Oregon white oak, and in unmanaged young forests of interior ponderosa pine (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). A special habitat feature for group 1 is large-diameter snags for nesting and foraging (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2). Both nuthatches are secondary cavity nesters and can use various nesting structures (McEllin 1979), whereas the white-headed woodpecker is a primary cavity excavator of soft snags and is therefore more limited by the degree of wood decay suitable for nest hole excavation (Garrett and others 1996). White-headed woodpeckers typically nest in snags and leaning logs, and occasionally nest in the dead tops of live trees (Garrett and others 1996, Milne and Hejl 1989). White-breasted nuthatches nest in natural cavities of live ponderosa pine more often than in snags (Brawn and Balda 1988, McEllin 1979). Suitable nest sites for all three species usually are found within the upper diameter classes of trees and snags. Average diameters reported for nest trees are 57.93 ± 3.65 cm (22.80 ± 1.43 in [± SE]) for pygmy nuthatch (McEllin 1979), 53.77 ± 1.76 cm (21.16 ± 0.61 in [± SE]) for white-breasted nuthatch (McEllin 1979), and 80 ± 65 cm (31 ± 25 in [± SE]) for white-headed woodpecker (Garrett and others 1996, Milne and Hejl 1989).

All three species forage primarily on live trees. White-breasted nuthatches glean insects from tree trunks and were observed in Colorado to spend nearly 75 percent of foraging time on ponderosa pine trunks (Bock 1969). In the same study, pygmy nuthatches foraged more generally in live ponderosa pine, dividing their foraging time fairly equally among needles, branches, and trunks. In Oregon, 80 percent of white-headed woodpecker foraging time was on live trees, and a preference was shown for trees with diameters >25 cm (10 in) (Bull and others 1986a).

Broad-scale changes in source habitats—Source habitats for group 1 likely occurred throughout the mountainous areas of the basin historically, and were most extensive throughout the Cascade Range, the Okanogan Mountains, and in central Oregon (fig. 4A). Currently, source habitats cover roughly the same geographical extent, but habitat patches appear more disjunct (fig. 4B). The Upper Klamath ERU continues to provide extensive source habitats, but elsewhere, <25 percent of most watersheds within the distribution of these species currently contains source habitats.

Basin-wide, >50 percent of watersheds had strong negative declines in the availability of source habitats (fig. 5). This basin-wide trend was mirrored within six ERUs that also had strong negative declines in more than 50 percent of the watersheds within the individual ERU boundaries: the Northern Cascades, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, Upper Clark Fork, Upper Snake, and Snake Headwaters ERUs (fig. 5). Source habitats in the Upper Snake and Snake Headwaters ERUs were less than 2 percent of either ERU, both historically and currently (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 3). The extent of coverage in the Northern Cascades, Northern Glaciated Mountains, and Lower Clark Fork, however, was substantial historically, accounting for 19 to 24 percent of the total area of these ERUs (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 3). In general, areas predominated by declining trends were in the northern basin, whereas the central and southwestern parts of the basin had mixed trends (fig. 4C).

Interpreting Results

Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats—Most projected declines in source habitats were due to losses, particularly in the northern part of the basin, of late-seral forests that today are in early- and mid-seral stages.

2 See table 1, volume 1, for common and scientific names of the vertebrate species of focus, and appendix 3, volume 3, for scientific and common names of plants and animals not addressed as terrestrial vertebrate species of focus.
Figure 3—Ranges of species in group 1 within the basin (from Marcot and others, in prep.). For species whose ranges shifted significantly from historical conditions, separate maps are shown for historical and current ranges; otherwise, the current range map also denotes the historical range.
Figure 4—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 1 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 5—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 1, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by $n$. 
Population status and trends—Population trends were estimated for all three species by using Breeding Bird Survey (BBS) route data from 1966 to 1995 (Sauer and others 1996). These data have not been summarized for the basin, but summaries for various states, USDI Fish and Wildlife Service regions, and BBS physiographic regions are available. Pygmy nuthatch numbers were stable within all summary geographic areas of relevance to the basin, which were physiographic region 64 (Central Rocky Mountains), USDI Fish and Wildlife Service Region 1 (5 western states), and the Western United States (11 western states) (Sauer and others 1996). White-breasted nuthatch numbers were stable in physiographic region 64 but increased 3.6 percent annually ($n = 149$, $P < 0.01$) in USDI Fish and Wildlife Service Region 1 and about the same throughout the Western United States. White-headed woodpecker numbers were not summarized for physiographic region 64 but increased 3.3 percent annually ($n = 45$, $P < 0.10$) in USDI Fish and Wildlife Service Region 1 and similarly throughout the 11 Western states (Sauer and others 1996).

Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integration of potential resource objectives for group 1 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—The results of our habitat trend analysis suggest the following issues are of high priority for group 1:

2. Basin-wide loss of large-diameter snags (>53 cm [21 in]).
3. High risk of additional loss of ponderosa pine habitat through stand-replacing fires.
4. Decline in old forests of aspen and cottonwood-willow.

Condition of special habitat features—Large-diameter ponderosa pine snags are a special habitat feature for group 1. In roaded areas with a history of timber sales, large-diameter snags $>53$ cm (21 in) have been reduced basin-wide (Hann and others 1997, Hessburg and others 1999, Quigley and others 1996). Nesting and foraging substrates for group 1 have therefore been reduced.

Other factors affecting the group—Roads indirectly affect group 1 because roaded areas in the basin have fewer snags than unroaded areas (Hann and others 1997). Roads enable snags to be cut, either in conjunction with timber sales, or by individuals seeking firewood. The additional loss of snags in areas where snags are already in low density could limit populations of species in group 1.
Potential strategies—The following strategies could be used to reverse broad-scale declines in source habitats:

1. (To address issue no. 1) Retain stands of interior and Pacific ponderosa pine where old-forest conditions are present, and actively manage to promote their long-term sustainability. The white-headed woodpecker has the most restricted distribution of all group members, and therefore the retention of existing old forests is particularly important within the range of this species where declines in old forests have been most pronounced: watersheds within the Northern Cascades, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Upper Clark Fork, Lower Clark Fork, and Blue Mountains ERUs.

2. (To address issue no. 1) Restore dominance of ponderosa pine to sites where transition to other cover types has occurred.

3. (To address issues no. 1 and no. 2) Accelerate development of late-seral conditions, including snag recruitment, within stands that are currently in mid-seral stages. Areas for emphasis are the same as those listed for strategy no. 1.

4. (To address issue no. 2) Include provisions for snag retention and snag recruitment where needed in all management plans involving forests used as source habitats for group 1.

5. (To address issue no. 3) Reduce risk of stand-replacing fires in late-seral ponderosa pine.

6. (To address issue no. 4) Within all ERUs with cottonwood-willow stands, maintain existing old forests and identify younger stands for eventual development of old-forest structural conditions. Return natural hydrologic regimes to large river systems, particularly in the Central Idaho Mountains, Upper Snake, and Snake Headwaters ERUs where large riparian cottonwood woodlands still remain.

Practices that support strategies—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategies nos. 1-4) Use understory thinning and prescribed burns to enhance development of ponderosa pine old forests and to reduce fuel loads. Refer to Blair and others (1995) for specific recommendations about live tree densities for the old-forest structural stage.

2. (In support of strategy no. 4) Retain existing snags, particularly if >53 cm (21 in), and provide measures for snag replacement. Review existing or develop new snag guidelines that reflect local ecological conditions and that address snag numbers, diameter, height, decay class, species, and distribution.

3. (In support of strategy no. 4) Reduce road densities in managed forests where ponderosa pine snags are currently in low abundance. Close roads after timber harvests and other management activities, and minimize the period when such roads are open, to minimize removal of snags along roads. In addition, or as an alternative to road management, actively enforce fuel wood regulations to minimize removal of large snags.

4. (In support of strategy no. 4) Restrict fuel wood permits to disallow snag cutting where ponderosa pine snags are in low abundance, and particularly where existing roads cannot be closed. Blair and others (1995) recommend that public fuel wood harvest should be limited to trees <38 cm (15 in) diameter at breast height (d.b.h.).

Group 2—Lewis’ Woodpecker (Migrant Population)

Results

Species ranges, source habitats, and special habitat features—Group 2 consists of populations of Lewis’ woodpecker that breed but do not overwinter in the basin. Breeding occurs in portions of all ERUs except the Upper Klamath and Northern Great Basin (fig. 6).

Source habitats of Lewis’woodpecker include old-forest, single-storied structural stages of ponderosa pine and multi-storied stages of Douglas-fir, western larch, and riparian cottonwood woodlands (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Unlike most woodpecker species, the Lewis’woodpecker is an aerial insectivore and requires openings for foraging maneuvers. Their breeding distribution is strongly associated with the distribution of ponderosa pine in western North
America (see Diem and Zeveloff 1980). This species often is classified as a specialist in burned pine forest habitat, although suitability of burned areas as habitat may differ with postfire age, size and intensity of burn, and geographic region (Block and Brennan 1987, Bock 1970, Linder 1994, Raphael and White 1984, Saab and Dudley 1998). Burned ponderosa pine forests created by stand-replacing fires seem to be highly productive source habitats compared to unburned pine or cottonwood riparian forest (see Tobalske 1997). Burned versus unburned stand condition was not included in the analysis of source habitat extent but is addressed in regards to source habitat quality.

Among nine cavity-nesting species, Lewis' woodpecker was a highly successful nester and the most abundant species nesting in a large (100 000 ha [250,000 acres]), recently burned pine forest in western Idaho (Saab and Dudley 1998). Openings in partially logged, burned forests likely provide greater opportunities for aerial foraging. Within the large burned forests in western Idaho, Lewis' woodpecker nested almost exclusively in salvage-logged units (1.1 nests per km [1.7 per mi] surveyed), compared to unlogged units (0.05 nests per km [0.08 per mi] surveyed); (2) in sites where snags were distributed in clumps; (3) in areas with densities of snags >23 cm (9 in) d.b.h. averaging 59.3 snags per ha (24 snags per acre); and (4) in areas with snag densities for trees >53 cm d.b.h. (21 in) averaging 15.6 snags per ha (6.3 snags per acre) (Saab and Dudley 1998). Nest sites generally are associated with an abundance of flying insects, open-canopy forest or tree clumps, snags, and dense ground cover in the form of shrubs, downed material, and grasses (Bock 1970, Saab and Dudley 1998, Tashiro-Vierling 1994, Tobalske 1997, Vierling 1997). In burned habitats in Wyoming (Linder 1994) and California (Block and Brennan 1987), the percentage of shrub canopy in breeding areas was 13 to 16 percent.

Snags are a special habitat feature for this species (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2). Lewis’ woodpeckers require large snags in an advanced state of decay or trees with soft sapwood for ease of cavity excavation.
Dramatic declines in source habitats seem widespread, based on strong negative trends in 85 percent of the watersheds throughout the basin (figs. 7C and 8). Strong negative trends were particularly evident in the northern watersheds of the basin (Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork ERUs), where more than 95 percent of the watersheds experienced declines (fig. 8). Relative change in extent of source habitats for the Lewis’ woodpecker was the greatest (that is, most negative) of any species analyzed in this report (vol. 1, table 7).

Interpreting Results

Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats—Declines in areal extent of source habitats were due primarily to a basin-wide alteration of old-forest ponderosa pine to mid-seral structural stages (Hann and others 1997). The current extent of mid-seral dry forest types is nearly twice the historical level (Hann and others 1997). In the northern and central ERUs, less than 10 percent of the historical extent of interior ponderosa pine in the old-forest single-story structural stage remains (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). Late-seral western larch also underwent immense declines and is nearly absent at the broad scale in all ERUs in which it historically occurred (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). Within the cottonwood-willow cover type, old forests have strongly declining trends throughout the basin (see vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4) and generally remain only in stands smaller than the 1-km² (0.4-mi²) mapping unit used in this analysis. These losses occurred from changes in historical hydrologic regimes. Flooding by reservoirs eliminated many cottonwood-willow stands, and reservoirs also reduced periodic flooding, a disturbance that is frequently needed for cottonwood seed establishment (Merigliano 1996, Roed and Heinze-Milne 1989). The declines in riparian woodlands, old-forest ponderosa pine, and western larch documented for the basin are part of a larger picture of similar declines throughout the Western United States (Noss and others 1995).

Condition of special habitat features—Abundance of large (>53 cm [21 in]), heavily decayed snags for nesting has been reduced basin-wide because of changes in vegetation structure from old-forest single stratum to mid-seral structures as well as snag removal by woodcutters (Hann and others 1997, Hessburg and others 1999, Quigley and others 1996). Reductions in

Broad-scale changes in source habitats—Historically, the greatest concentrations of Lewis’ woodpecker source habitats (excluding burned coniferous forest and riparian habitat that were not considered at the scale of this analysis) were in the Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Blue Mountains ERUs (fig. 7A). Up to 50 percent of several watersheds within these ERUs are thought to have provided source habitats, whereas lesser amounts of source habitats likely occurred in most watersheds of the Columbia Plateau, Southern Cascades, Upper Clark Fork, Central Idaho Mountains, and Snake Headwaters ERUs (fig. 7A).

The current amount of source habitat is significantly reduced from historical levels in all 11 ERUs that provide source habitat (fig. 7B). The Central Idaho Mountains currently provide the most contiguous habitats, yet these comprise <25 percent of most watersheds (fig. 7B).
Figure 7—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 2 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 8—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 2, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by n.
the amount of old-forest single stratum and stand initiation structures have reduced forest patch openings that allow foraging maneuvers. In the central and southern regions of the basin, increases in closed-canopy, multi-storied forests have reduced understory shrubs and presumably reduced the abundance of associated arthropods on which Lewis’ woodpecker feed.

Other factors affecting the group—Road densities have significantly increased throughout the basin (Hann and others 1997), thereby allowing greater human access into forested regions and greater potential for snag removal along roads. Prolonged human presence at or near nest sites may cause abandonment (Bock 1970), although stable populations coexist with park development and heavy tourist use during the breeding season in British Columbia (Siddle and Davidson 1991). Chlorinated hydrocarbons (such as DDT, a pesticide formerly used in fruit orchards and gardens) could have potential negative effects on Lewis’ woodpeckers (Tobalske 1997) because they sometimes nest in agricultural settings (Sorensen 1986, Tashiro-Vierling 1994). Elevated energetic costs and stress may be associated with high rates of territorial encounters with European starlings, which could reduce reproductive success even if Lewis’ woodpecker dominates the interaction (Siddle and Davidson 1991).

Population status and trends—Breeding Bird Surveys indicate that population trends have been stable within the basin from 1968 to 1994 (Saab and Rich 1997). Saab and Rich (1997), however, included the Lewis’ woodpecker as one of 15 Neotropical migrants in the basin that are of high concern to management under all future management themes for the basin, because of the close association of the species with old forest stages of ponderosa pine. Populations may have declined by about 60 percent within the Western United States since the 1960s, on the basis of BBS data (1966 to 1995, -4.0 percent per yr, n = 61, P < 0.01; Sauer and others 1996). Also, Christmas Bird Counts (CBC) showed a decline in Lewis’ woodpecker observations across the entire range of the species, from an average of 10 birds per 1,000 observation hours in 1960 to about four birds per 1,000 observation hours in 1989 (n = 20, P < 0.05; Tashiro-Vierling 1994).

Trend data generated by the BBS and CBC may not be adequate for monitoring populations of Lewis’ woodpecker (Saab and Rich 1997, Tobalske 1997) because of their sporadic distribution (Bock 1970) and relatively uncommon status (DeSante and Pyle 1986). Dramatic cycles of abundance may be related to local changes in habitat (Bock 1970) and to nomadic behavior of Lewis’ woodpeckers in search of burned forests for nesting habitat.

Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integrating potential resource objectives for group 2 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—The following issues were identified from results of our analysis in combination with relevant vegetation dynamics documented by Hann and others (1997):

1. Declines in shrub understories of montane and lower montane forests.
4. Decline in availability of large snags and trees for foraging and nesting.
5. Potential for negative impacts from agricultural pesticides.

Potential strategies—The issues identified above suggest the following broad-scale strategies for the long-term persistence of Lewis’ woodpecker.

1. (To address issue no. 1) Rejuvenate and enhance shrub understory of lower montane community groups (old-forest ponderosa pine) and montane community groups that include interior Douglas-fir and western larch in the Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, Upper Clark Fork, and Blue Mountains ERUs.
2. (To address issue no. 2) Restore degraded stands and maintain high-quality existing stands of old-forest interior and Pacific ponderosa pine, interior
Douglas-fir, western larch, and cottonwood-willow. Protection and restoration of existing old forests is especially important within the range of this species where declines in old forests have been most pronounced. Areas of emphasis include Blue Mountains, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Upper Clark Fork, Lower Clark Fork, and Central Idaho Mountains ERUs. Within these same ERUs, accelerate development of old forests within stands that are currently mid-seral structural stages.

3. (To address issue no. 3) Within all ERUs with cottonwood-willow stands, maintain existing old forests, and identify younger stands for eventual development of old-forest structural conditions. Return natural hydrologic regimes to large river systems, particularly in the Central Idaho Mountains, Upper Snake, and Snake Headwaters ERUs where large cottonwood riparian woodlands still remain.

4. (To address issue no. 4) Retain all large-diameter (>53 cm d.b.h. [21 in]) ponderosa pine, cottonwood, Douglas-fir, and western larch snags within the basin, preferably in clumps, and provide opportunities for snag recruitment.

5. (To address issue no. 5) Reduce exposure to pesticides during nesting season. Avoid use of toxic chlorinated hydrocarbons and organophosphorus insecticides near Lewis’ woodpecker nesting sites.

Practices that support strategies—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategies no. 1 and no. 2) Use prescribed burns and understory thinning of small-diameter trees (≤25 cm d.b.h. [10 in]) to maintain existing old-forest ponderosa pine stands and to accelerate development of mid-successional stages to old-forest conditions. These practices also can be used to enhance and develop shrub understories (>13 percent shrub canopy) to attract arthropod prey.

2. (In support of strategies no. 1 and no. 2) Allow stand-replacing wildfires to burn in lower montane wilderness and other lands managed with a reserve emphasis (for example, designated wilderness, research natural areas, and areas of critical environmental concern). Such opportunities can be found particularly in the Central Idaho Mountains, Blue Mountains, and Snake Headwaters ERUs, and in western Montana.

3. (In support of strategy no. 4) Develop measures for snag recruitment in unburned forests. Management for snag recruitment (particularly broken-topped snags) in unburned forests with high risks of stand-replacing fires will provide nest trees during the first few years after wildfire when other trees are not easily excavated.

4. (In support of strategy no. 4) In salvage-logged, postfire ponderosa pine forests, retain snags in clumps rather than evenly spaced, leaving both hard and soft decay classes to lengthen the time that those stands are suitable for nesting by Lewis’ woodpeckers. Snag densities should approximate 59 snags per ha (24 snags per acre) of d.b.h. size >23 cm [9 in], and of these, about 15 snags per ha (6 snags per acre) should be large snags (≥53 cm d.b.h. [21 in]) (Saab and Dudley 1998).

5. (In support of strategy no. 4) Minimize the density of roads open to motorized vehicles. Close roads after timber harvests and other management activities, and maintain short periods during which such roads are open to minimize removal of snags along roads. In addition or as an alternative to road management, actively enforce fuel wood regulations to minimize removal of large snags.

6. (In support of strategy no. 4) Restrict fuel wood permits to disallow snag cutting where ponderosa pine snags are in low abundance, and particularly where existing roads cannot be closed. Blair and others (1995) recommend for Idaho that public fuel wood harvest should be limited to trees <38 cm (15 in) d.b.h.

7. (In support of strategy no. 5) Avoid use of toxic agricultural insecticides near Lewis’ woodpecker nest sites.

Group 3—Western Gray Squirrel

Results

Species ranges, source habitats, and special habitat features—Group 3 is composed of the western gray
squirrel, a year-round resident of the basin. The western gray squirrel is distributed within the western portion of the basin. Its range includes the Southern Cascades, most of the Northern Cascades and Upper Klamath, and portions of the Northern Glaciated Mountains, Columbia Plateau, and Northern Great Basin ERUs (fig. 9). Currently, however, only small, disjunct areas within this range are occupied by squirrel populations (Ryan and Carey 1995).

Source habitats for the western gray squirrel include interior ponderosa pine and Oregon white oak woodlands (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Structural stages of interior ponderosa pine that provide source habitat are old-forest single-story, old-forest multi-story, and both managed and unmanaged young forest.

Mast-producing trees are an important component of western gray squirrel habitat. Species of mast-producing trees differ throughout the range of the squirrel and include both the native Oregon white oak and introduced English and black walnuts (Barnum 1975). The western gray squirrel uses tree cavities and stick nests as winter dens and for rearing young (Ryan and Carey 1995). The presence of a contiguous tree canopy that allows for arboreal travel around nest sites is also an important habitat feature (ICBEMP 1996c).

**Broad-scale changes in source habitats**—The trend in broad-scale source habitats for western gray squirrels from historical to current periods was mixed (fig. 10). Moderate or strong decreases were projected in about 30 percent of the watersheds basin-wide, with moderate to strong increases in nearly an equal number (fig. 11). In the Northern Cascades, there were negative and strongly negative trends in about 65 percent of the watersheds (fig. 11). More than half the watersheds in the Northern Great Basin had declining or strongly declining trends. In the Columbia Plateau, there were increasing or strongly increasing trends in about 65 percent of watersheds (fig. 11). Other ERUs either showed mixed trends in source habitats (Southern Cascades, Upper Klamath) or had few watersheds that fell within the range of the squirrel (Blue Mountains, Northern Glaciated Mountains).
Figure 10—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 3 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 11—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 3, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥ 60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥ 20 percent but < 60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of < 20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥ 20 percent but < 60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥ 60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by $n$. 
Interpreting Results

Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats—Declines in source habitats in the Northern Cascades were due to large decreases in old-forest single-story, old-forest multi-story, and unmanaged young-forest structural stages of interior ponderosa pine (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). In the Northern Great Basin, most of the decline resulted from decreases in old-forest single-storied interior ponderosa pine (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). Increasing trends in the Columbia Plateau were mostly due to increases in the managed young-forest stage of interior ponderosa pine.

Although oak woodlands were listed as an important source habitat, there was not a measurable vegetation change in this cover type in the ERUs within the range of the species (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). In many cases, oak woodlands do not occur in large patches in the basin and may not have been adequately sampled by the 1-km² (0.4-mi²) pixel size used to interpret vegetation.

Condition of special habitats features—Mast-producing trees, such as oak, likely have declined primarily because of increasing human developments (Washington Department of Wildlife 1993c). In roaded areas with a history of timber harvests, densities of large-diameter trees (>53 cm [21 in] d.b.h.) have declined from historical conditions (Hann and others 1997, Hessburg and others 1999, Quigley and others 1996), thus reducing the availability of cavities.

Other factors affecting the group—Introduced eastern fox squirrels and gray squirrels (eastern) are potential competitors in parts of the range of the western gray squirrel (Ryan and Carey 1995). Humans often shoot western gray squirrels both legally and illegally. In Washington, the western gray squirrel is protected from hunting; in Oregon, however, the western gray squirrel is a game species and is regarded as a pest in nut orchards (Ryan and Carey 1995).

Local extirpations caused by mange infestations have seriously affected populations of western gray squirrels. Recovery of populations from disease outbreaks may be difficult when populations are small and widely dispersed (Ryan and Carey 1995).

Population status and trends—Although there is no specific evidence of a reduction in range of western gray squirrels from historical conditions, there is evidence that populations within the range are sparser and more scattered (Washington Department of Wildlife 19993c). This suggests a declining population trend, but there are no direct population data available to confirm the trend.

Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integrating potential resource objectives for group 3 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—Our results, combined with literature and other empirical information, suggest that the following issues are important for the western gray squirrel:

1. Loss of habitat because of increased human development, timber harvest, and other management activities.
2. Loss or decline of oak trees as a cover type and within other cover types.
3. Isolation of squirrel populations because of loss of habitat.
4. Interspecific competition with nonnative squirrels.
5. Direct mortality because of hunting and illegal shooting.

Potential strategies—Issues for the squirrel suggest that the following strategies may help land managers effectively address declines in habitats or populations within the range of the squirrel in the basin:

1. (To address issues no. 1 and no. 2) Across the current range of the squirrel, provide source habitats composed of young- and old-forest interior ponderosa pine stands that include an oak component.
2. (To address issue no. 2) Manage for the maintenance and restoration of oak woodlands.
3. (To address issue no. 3) Provide connectivity among current squirrel populations (Ryan and
Carey 1995) by increasing the areal extent of habitats where these have declined, particularly in watersheds within the Northern Cascades, Southern Cascades, and Upper Klamath ERUs.

4. (To address issues no. 4 and no. 5) Coordinate with other agencies and parties on cooperative efforts to ensure that habitats and populations are maintained.

**Practices that support strategies**—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategy no. 1) Where mixed-coniferous/deciduous forest stands have the potential to support a significant oak component, manage them to provide a mixed tree species composition by (1) killing overtopping conifers to allow oaks to grow to an open form; (2) thinning dense pure oak and conifer-oak stands to reduce crowding and water stress and allow remaining oaks to become larger, more vigorous, more productive, and more fire-resistant; (3) removing smaller conifer trees under the oak canopy that are competing with oaks for water and that will eventually overtop the oaks (Ryan and Carey 1995); and (4) retaining old and large conifers within oaks stands where these trees are widely spaced and have an open crown that intercepts little sunlight while providing good year-round shelter for wildlife and their nests (Ryan and Carey 1995).

2. (In support of strategy no. 2) Manage oak woodlands to achieve the following attributes: (1) large, live, open-form oaks; (2) nearby water; (3) adjacent intergrading stands of ponderosa pine; (4) associated deciduous trees and shrubs; (5) a second age class of closed-form oaks to replace aging oaks; (6) natural prairie plant associations to provide an open to patchy understory; and (7) corridors linking habitat fragments (Ryan and Carey 1995). Minimum size of oak stands should be 2 ha (5 acres), with a desired size of 4 ha (10 acres) (Ryan and Carey 1995).

3. (In support of strategies no. 2 and no. 3) Identify and emphasize the location of mature oak stands in relevant management plans, particularly where such stands could potentially link existing populations. Include oak preservation in planning criteria (Ryan and Carey 1995). Increase public awareness of Oregon white oak and western gray squirrels (Ryan and Carey 1995).

4. (In support of strategy no. 4) Improve coordination among state agencies to design hunting seasons to target only areas of crop depredations and to avoid introductions of competitive species.

**Group 4—Blue Grouse (Winter)**

**Results**

**Species ranges and source habitats**—This group consists of winter habitat for blue grouse. Blue grouse are widely distributed across the basin, occurring along the crest of the Cascade Range, in the Blue Mountains, and throughout Idaho and western Montana (fig. 12). Spring and summer habitat for blue grouse occurs at lower elevation than winter habitat, and is discussed in group 17. Specific winter source habitats for blue grouse are old-forest single-story, old-forest multi-story, and understory reinitiation stages of interior Douglas-fir, western larch, Sierra Nevada mixed conifer, Pacific ponderosa pine, and interior ponderosa pine; and mixed-conifer woodlands (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1).

**Broad-scale changes in source habitats**—Significant areas of blue grouse winter range occur in 9 of the 13 ERUs (fig. 12). Within the winter range of the blue grouse, there has been an overall decline in its winter habitat with about 70 percent of watersheds showing a moderate or strong decline (figs. 13 and 14). Moderate or strong declines occurred in source habitat in at least 50 percent of watersheds within eight ERUs that included the Northern Cascades, Southern Cascades, Blue Mountains, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, Upper Clark Fork, Snake Headwaters, and Central Idaho Mountains (figs. 13 and 14). Moderate or strong habitat increases were projected in over 50 percent of watersheds only in the Upper Klamath. The Northern Great Basin, Columbia Plateau, Owyhee Uplands, and Upper Snake ERUs contain only small areas of blue grouse winter habitat (fig. 13).
Interpreting Results

Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats—Many of the cover types and structural stage combinations estimated to provide source habitats for wintering blue grouse have decreased in area from historical to current periods (Hann and others 1997; vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). Interior ponderosa pine old-forest single-story stage was the major contributor to declines in habitat in seven of the eight ERUs, with moderate or strong declines (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). Other habitats that declined within these ERUs were interior ponderosa pine understory reinitiation and old-forest multi-storied stages, interior Douglas-fir old-forest single- and multi-storied stages, western larch old-forest multi-storied stage, and mixed-conifer woodland (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). In the Upper Klamath, the only ERU for which a moderate or strong increase was projected, the largest increases were projected for interior ponderosa pine old-forest multi-storied stage and interior Douglas-fir old-forest single- and multi-storied stages (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4).

Other factors affecting the group—Blue grouse are sedentary during winter, moving only 69 m (226 ft) per day on average (Cade and Hoffman 1993, Hines 1986). Their sedentary nature makes them vulnerable to various predators such as lynx, red fox, weasels, American marten, merlin, prairie falcon, northern goshawk, and Cooper’s hawk (Zwickel 1992). There are, however, no reports of predation seriously depressing blue grouse populations.

Population status and trends—Although blue grouse still occupy most of their original range (fig. 12), accounts suggest higher historical densities in parts of their range (Zwickel 1992). There are, however, no empirical data on population trend for blue grouse within the basin.

Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integrating potential resource objectives for group 4 with broader,
Figure 13—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 4 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 14—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 4, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of $\geq 60$ percent; 1 = an increase of $\geq 20$ percent but $< 60$ percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of $< 20$ percent; -1 = a decrease of $\geq 20$ percent but $< 60$ percent; and -2 = a decrease of $\geq 60$ percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by $n$. 
ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—Our analysis indicates winter habitats for blue grouse have declined in the basin; the following issue could be addressed for this species within overall ecosystem-based strategies:

1. Reduction in the amount of montane and lower montane old forests.

Potential strategies—Blue grouse winter habitat could be improved by strategies that focus on the following:

1. (To address issue no. 1) Retain existing interior ponderosa pine, interior Douglas-fir, and western larch old forests, with highest priority for retaining watersheds that still support substantial blue grouse winter habitat within ERUs that have shown large decreases in habitat.

2. (To address issue no. 1) Manage early- and mid-seral montane and lower montane forests to accelerate restoration of late-seral conditions of interior ponderosa pine, interior Douglas-fir, and western larch.

Practices that support strategies—The following practice would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategies no. 1 and no. 2) Retain remnant, large trees (Pekins and others 1991) in all seral stages of montane forests. In a Colorado study, Cade and Hoffman (1990) found wintering blue grouse in late-seral Douglas-fir stands as small as 1 ha (2.5 acres). Remington and Hoffman (1996) recommended selective logging that would retain clumps of trees of that size.

Group 5—Northern Goshawk (Summer), Flammulated Owl, American Marten, and Fisher

Results

Species ranges, source habitats, and special habitat features—Group 5 consists of the northern goshawk, flammulated owl, American marten, and fisher. Only summer habitat for northern goshawks is included in this group. Goshawk winter habitat is analyzed separately as group 25 because it includes juniper habitats not used by other members of this group. Flammulated owls migrate out of the basin in winter, so only their breeding habitat is represented in this group. Goshawks occur throughout forested areas of the basin (fig. 15). Flammulated owls are broadly distributed throughout the Northern Cascades, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Upper and Lower Clark Fork, Blue Mountains, Central Idaho Mountains, and Upper Klamath ERUs. The range of the American marten includes parts of the western, central eastern, and northeastern portions of the basin (fig. 15). Currently the fisher occurs in the western portion of the basin and in central and northern Idaho and western Montana (fig. 15); historically its range included more areas in the northern, central, and eastern portions of the basin (fig. 15).

Source habitats common to all four species are late-seral stages of the montane community group; unmanaged young forests also are source habitats because this structural stage, like late-seral stages, contains sufficient large-diameter snags and logs needed for various life functions of species in the group (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Managed young-forest stages do not provide source habitat because of the lack of remnant large trees and snags. Source habitats for martens extend up into these same stages of subalpine forests, whereas habitats for goshawks and flammulated owls extend down into the same stages of lower montane forests. For goshawks, flammulated owls, and martens, source habitat also is provided by the old-forest multi-storied and unmanaged young-forest stages of aspen, whereas goshawks, flammulated owls, and fishers find source habitat in these same stages of cottonwood willow. In addition, flammulated owls use limber pine (McCallum and Gehlbach 1988) and mixed-conifer woodlands as source habitats, and goshawks use chokecherry-serviceberry-rose as source habitats.

Goshawks nest in various forest structural conditions, from open, parklike stands of aspen (Younk and Bechard 1994) to multi-storied old forests (Reynolds 1983). Nest stands are generally characterized by large trees and the densest canopy cover available within the area (Reynolds and others 1992) but are occasionally located in small-diameter trees (Hayward and Escano 1989, Squires and Ruggiero 1996). Foraging occurs in various cover types and structural stages, and the juxtaposition of several habitats may
Figure 15—Ranges of species in group 5 within the basin (from Marcot and others, in prep.). For species whose ranges shifted significantly from historical conditions, separate maps are shown for historical and current ranges; otherwise, the current range map also denotes the historical range.
enhance the quality of foraging habitat around nest sites (Hargis and others 1994). Home range for a nesting pair is estimated at >2400 ha (5,930 acres) (Hargis and others 1994, Kennedy and others 1994, Reynolds and others 1992).

Martens seem more sensitive to patch size than are other group members and usually avoid clearcuts dominated by grasses, forbs, and saplings, especially in winter. These areas do not provide access to the subnivean zone or offer protection from predation, and they have more severe microclimatic conditions than areas with forest cover (Buskirk and Powell 1994). At the broad scale, the presence of multiple clearcuts may render the entire landscape unsuitable. In Utah, martens were rarely found in areas with >25 percent of the landscape in a combination of natural openings and clearcuts (Hargis 1996). In Maine, no adult female territories were found in landscapes with >31 percent of mature forest cover removed (Chapin 1995).

Although fishers will cross openings to access forested areas (Arthur and others 1989), a negative association with clearcuts has been documented. Fisher occurrence in California was positively associated with large stands of mature forest and distance from clearcuts (Rosenburg and Raphael 1986); fishers in Idaho avoided stands with <40 percent canopy cover (Jones 1991, Jones and Garton 1994).

Old forests consisting of ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir seem to be a key component of flammulated owl home ranges (Reynolds and Linkhart 1992). Home ranges composed of at least 75 percent old ponderosa pine/Douglas-fir forest were occupied more continuously than home ranges consisting of less than 75 percent in this forest type (Reynolds and Linkhart 1990). Variability in the structure of these old stands seems important to support life functions of flammulated owls. Roosting occurs in fairly dense stands. Goggans (1986) showed that tree densities immediately surrounding roost trees average 2016 per ha (816 per acre), whereas overall home ranges average 589 trees per ha (238 per acre). In contrast, relatively
open stands seem to be selected for foraging (Linkhart 1984), and open, mature stands are selected for nest sites (McCallum 1994). In two Oregon studies, mean d.b.h. of nest trees was 56.3 cm (22.2 in) (Goggans 1986) and 72.0 cm (28.4 in) (Bull and others 1990).

Several special habitat features have been identified for this group (see vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2). Fishers and American martens use down logs. Downed woody material is likely the key component of foraging areas for marten (Coffin and others 1997), providing habitat for many of their prey, particularly southern red-backed voles, and subnivean access to prey during winter (Corn and Raphael 1992). Fishers and martens depend on down logs for resting and denning (Buskirk and Powell 1994, Raphael and Jones 1997). Snags are a special habitat feature for flammulated owls, fishers, and martens. Flammulated owls nest in cavities in both snags and large live trees (Bull and others 1990, McCallum and Gehlbach 1988). Snags provide rest sites and den sites for fishers and martens.

Broad-scale changes in source habitats—
Historically, source habitats likely occurred throughout the forested portions of the basin, with some of the greatest concentrations in the western, central, and northern portions of the basin (fig. 16A). Currently, the largest extent of source habitats is in the south-central and southwestern portions of the basin (fig. 16B). The primary change from historical to current times has been a broad shift in the geographic distribution of source habitats away from the north and towards the southwestern portion of the basin (fig. 16C).

Basin-wide, there were moderately or strongly declining habitat trends in nearly 70 percent of watersheds within the range of species in group 5, and neutral or increasing trends in about 30 percent of watersheds (fig. 17).

Positive changes in source habitat occurred in more than 50 percent of watersheds in the Upper Klamath and Northern Great Basin ERUs; mixed trends in the Southern Cascades and Upper Snake ERUs; and negative trends in more than 50 percent of watersheds in all remaining ERUs (figs. 16 and 17). The most strongly negative trends were projected across the northern portion of the basin in the Northern Cascades, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork ERUs (figs. 16 and 17).

Interpreting Results

Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats—Interior ponderosa pine old-forest single-story stage declined in all but one of the ERUs in which source habitat declined in more than 50 percent of watersheds (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). Interior ponderosa pine old-forest multi-story stage declined in nearly half of these ERUs. Less consistent declines were projected for the old-forest single-story stage of interior Douglas-fir; the old-forest multi-story stages of interior Douglas-fir, lodgepole pine, grand fir-white fir, Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir, western larch, and western white pine; the unmanaged young forest stages of whitebark pine, Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir, western larch, and lodgepole pine; and mixed-conifer woodland (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). In the ERUs with the most strongly negative trends, the Northern Cascades, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork, negative trends were projected for up to nine of these habitat types (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). In the Upper Klamath, the only ERU with a significant amount of source habitat for the group and a positive trend in more than 50 percent of watersheds, the increasing trend was associated with increases in the old-forest multi-story stages of interior ponderosa pine, interior Douglas-fir, lodgepole pine, and grand fir-white fir; and the old-forest single-story stage of interior Douglas-fir. In addition, riparian woodland (including aspen and cottonwood-willow) declined basin-wide, and also underwent a shift from early- and late-seral stages to mid-seral stages (Hann and others 1997).

Condition of special habitat features—Densities of large-diameter snags (>53 cm [21 in] d.b.h.) declined basin-wide from historical to current levels (Hann and others 1997, Hessburg and others 1999, Quigley and others 1996). Trends in snag abundance ultimately affect the availability of large down logs and cavities.

Other factors affecting the group—Populations of martens and fishers can be impacted by fur harvesting if trapping is not carefully regulated (Fortin and Cantin 1994, Jones 1991, Quick 1956). Trapping also affects populations by altering the sex and age structure through the disproportionate capture of juveniles and males (Hodgman and others 1994, Quick 1956). Historically, both martens and fishers were heavily
Figure 16—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 5 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 17—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 5, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of >20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by n.
trapped in the basin. Currently, martens are still trapped in all states in the basin, but fishers are only trapped in Montana (Heinemeyer 1995).

Secondary roads in forested areas increase trapping pressures for martens and fishers, resulting in significantly higher captures in roaded versus unroaded areas (Hodgman and others 1994) and in logged versus unlogged areas, in which the difference was again attributed to higher road densities in logged stands (Thompson 1994). Secondary roads also might increase the likelihood that snags and logs will be removed for fuel wood. This could impact fishers, martens and flammulated owls, and also could have a negative effect on the prey base for goshawks (Reynolds and others 1992).

Studies have shown that fisher, marten, and goshawk populations respond to food limitation. Fisher populations can undergo fluctuations related to prey abundance (Powell and Zielinski 1994). Marten populations also have been observed to decline after a decline in principal prey species (Thompson and Colgan 1987, Weckwerth and Hawley 1962). Some of the decline is due to lower reproductive rates in females, but evidence of starvation also has been observed (Hodgman and others 1994, Weckwerth and Hawley 1962). Several studies suggest that goshawk populations are frequently food-limited. In Alaska and the Yukon where snowshoe hare is a dominant prey item, goshawk numbers fluctuate with snowshoe hare cycles (Doyle and Smith 1994). A review of several studies by Widen (1989) suggests correlations between goshawk numbers and other prey. Maj and others (1995) suggest that heavy levels of grazing in ponderosa pine communities may degrade insect habitat and reduce prey populations for flammulated owls.

Changes in forest structure related to fire suppression seem to increase the extent of some of the cover types and structural stages judged to be source habitats for goshawks. However, such stands, which are characterized by closed canopies and dense conifer understory, may not be as valuable to goshawks as the more open habitats, which they replaced. A high density of small-diameter understory trees may be detrimental to foraging and nesting aspects of goshawk ecology in at least three ways: (1) by obstructing flight corridors used by goshawks to obtain forest-associated prey; (2) by suppressing tree growth needed to produce large-diameter trees for nest sites; and (3) by reducing the growth of an herbaceous understory that supports potential prey species (Reynolds and others 1992). Therefore, although fire suppression may have increased the extent of multi-storied closed forests within the basin, the inherent value of these stands may be less than that of more open stands maintained by fire. This supposition warrants further investigation.

Conversely, the harvest of large-diameter overstory trees can create forest structures that are more open than normally used by goshawks. A secondary effect is increased competition with raptors adapted to more open habitats (Moore and Henny 1983). Goshawk nest sites are more frequently used by red-tailed hawks, great horned owls, or long-eared owls in harvested areas than in unharvested sites (Crocker-Bedford 1990, Patla 1990).

Flammulated owls are Neotropical migrants, so their population status may be affected by conditions of their winter habitat. Their winter range is suspected to be in southern Mexico and northern Central America (McCallum 1994).

Population status and trends—Fishers may be close to extirpation in Washington (Aubry and Houston 1992, cited in Powell and Zielinski 1994), and sightings are rare in Oregon. The last reliable reports of native fishers in Idaho and Montana were during the 1920s (Dodge 1977, Weckwerth and Wright 1968, cited in Powell and Zielinski 1994). Fisher populations were reintroduced to Idaho in the 1960s and to Montana in the 1950s and 1980s (Powell and Zielinski 1994). Projected declines in source habitats may have contributed to historical extirpations, coupled with the effects of trapping and the fragmented nature of remaining habitats.

The distribution of marten within the basin has been fairly stable since historical times, but population changes are not known, other than through trapping records, which fluctuate widely with fur prices and may not reflect actual population trends.

The BBS data for the goshawk were insufficient to determine population trends for the basin (Saab and Rich 1997) or for any state or physiographic region within the basin (Sauer and others 1996) because of low detection of goshawks under the BBS survey method. Sufficient data were available, however, for...
western North America to indicate a stable trend in numbers between the years 1966 and 1995 (Sauer and others 1996).

A separate trend estimate was derived from fall migration counts conducted by Hawkwatch International at four locations in Utah and New Mexico. These data indicated an average rate of decline in migrating goshawks of about 4 percent annually between 1977 and 1991 (Hoffman and others 1992). The extent to which the migration data represented local declines near the survey stations was not determined.

No population trend data were found for flammulated owls. The BBS survey method is not adequate for surveying flammulated owls because of low numbers and nocturnal behavior. Specialized monitoring would be required to determine the population trend of owls (Saab and Rich 1997).

Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integrating potential resource objectives for group 5 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—The following issues were identified from the results of our analysis and published research:

1. Reduction in the amount of old-forests and associated structures (snags, logs, and cavities), particularly within the montane and lower montane community groups.

2. Fragmentation of habitat.

3. Low population numbers of fisher.

4. Negative effects resulting from higher road densities in source habitats. For marten throughout the basin and fishers in Montana, there is increased trapping pressure associated with roads. For all species in the group, loss of snags and logs associated with firewood collection may be higher along open roads.

5. Declines in overall extent of aspen and cottonwood-willow, and shifts from early- and late-seral to mid-seral stages of these cover types (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4).

6. Possibly unsustainable conditions of old forests where there have been large transitions from shade-intolerant to shade-tolerant tree species. This last issue stems from the exclusion of fire from many forested communities, which has resulted in increased susceptibility to stand-replacing fires (USDA Forest Service 1996).

7. Decline in suitable foraging areas around goshawk nest sites. On Federal lands, the immediate areas around active nests generally are protected from timber harvests, but the larger foraging areas surrounding nests frequently are managed without explicit consideration of goshawk foraging. Goshawks typically use a nest stand and nearby alternative nest stands for many years, and therefore, the long-term maintenance of suitable foraging areas is as important for successful reproduction as protection of the immediate nest stand.

Potential strategies—The following strategies could be used to reverse broad-scale declines in source habitats and populations:

1. (To address issue no. 1) Increase the representation of late-seral forests in all cover types used as source habitats, particularly in the northern half of the basin (Northern Cascades, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork ERUs).

2. (To address issue no. 2) Increase connectivity of disjunct habitat patches and prevent further reduction of large blocks of contiguous habitat.

3. (To address issues no. 3 and no. 4) Identify potential species strongholds for long-term management of marten and fisher (see practice no. 6 for criteria).

4. (To address issue no. 4) Reduce human disturbances in source habitats.

5. (To address issue no. 5) Restore aspen and cottonwood-willow forests, particularly the unmanaged young-forest and late-seral stages.
6. (To address issue no. 6) Reduce the risk of loss of habitat by focusing old-forest retention and restoration efforts on areas where fire regimes are either nonlethal or mixed (USDA Forest Service 1996). In ERUs where old-forest habitat has remained stable or increased from historical conditions, efforts could be focused on retaining existing habitat in areas with lower fire and insect risk while managing other areas to reduce risks of catastrophic loss of habitat.

7. (To address issue no. 7) Maintain stands with active goshawk nests in old-forest condition.

8. (To address issue no. 7) Embed the conservation of old forests within a larger, ecosystem context that considers historical fire regimes and landscape patterns and the habitat needs of species that are prey of the members of this group. For goshawks, Reynolds and others (1992) gave specific recommendations for promoting various cover types and structural stages in 2430 ha (6,005 acres) of potential home range around each active nest.

Practices that support strategies—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategy no. 1) In the northern basin, identify representative stands of old forests for retention and mid-successional stages for development into old-forest conditions. Priority should be given to large blocks having high interior-to-edge ratios and few large openings.

2. (In support of strategy no. 1) Actively recruit snags and logs from green trees to increase the representation of old-forest structures (snags and logs) in mid-seral stands and in old forests where snags and logs are in low density or absent.

3. (In support of strategy no. 1) Retain slash piles and decks of cull logs to substitute for down logs over the short term. Raphael and Jones (1997) recommend retaining a minimum of 1.3 slash piles per ha (0.5 per acre) on a site that has been extensively harvested.

4. (In support of strategy no. 2) Where possible, use selection harvest rather than clearcutting. If clearcuts are used, aggregate cuts so that large blocks of unharvested forest are retained.

5. (In support of strategy no. 2) Adjust activities, including timber harvests, to provide links among currently isolated patches of source habitats.

6. (In support of strategy no. 3) Identify existing areas with the following desired conditions, or manage selected areas to create the following desired conditions for strongholds: existing populations of marten or fisher, or both; large, contiguous blocks of forest cover with a high percentage of late-seral stages, abundant snags and large logs, low road densities and overall low human disturbance, and potential connectivity to currently unoccupied source habitats.

7. (In support of strategy no. 4) Minimize new construction of secondary roads and close unneeded roads after timber harvest.

8. (In support of strategy no. 5) Use clearcutting to regenerate aspen. Where aspen regeneration is inhibited by domestic or wild ungulate browsing, use exclosures to protect regenerating stands or modify management to reduce browsing pressure.

9. (In support of strategy no. 5) Survey and map existing old forests of cottonwoods and reference their locations in land management planning documents. Monitor conditions of cottonwood stands to ensure that sufficient seedling or vegetative regeneration, or both, is occurring. Identify factors limiting regeneration so that appropriate corrective measures can be taken. For example, return natural hydrologic regimes to portions of large river systems that support cottonwood riparian woodlands.

10. (In support of strategy no. 6) Manage risks of catastrophic loss by using prescribed fire and thinning to reduce fuel loading and to encourage the development of forest openings, shrub openings, and shade-intolerant and fire-, insect-, and disease-resistant tree species.

11. (In support of strategy no. 7) Identify an area around each active goshawk nest site to be maintained in old-forest condition, and identify possible replacement stands. The Northern Goshawk Scientific Committee for the FS recommends three 12-ha (30-acre) nest stands per breeding pair and
three additional 12-ha (30-acre) replacement stands be located within a 2430-ha (6,000-acre) area that functions as a potential home range (Reynolds and others 1992).

12. (In support of strategies no. 6 and no. 8) Use silvicultural prescriptions in conjunction with restoration of fire regimes to create a desired mix of cover types and structural stages within the potential home range of each active goshawk nest. The Northern Goshawk Scientific Committee for the FS (Reynolds and others 1992) has identified two larger habitat use areas that extend beyond the nest site: a postfledgling-family area, encompassing about 170 ha (420 acres) around the nest and used by a nesting pair and offspring from the time the young leave the nest until they are independent, and a foraging area of about 2190 ha (5,411 acres) that provides the food resource during and after the breeding period (Reynolds and others 1992). For forests in the Southwestern United States, they recommended that four-fifths of each postfledgling family area and each foraging area be equally divided among four seral stages: young, mid aged, mature, and old forests, and the remaining one-fifth be equally divided between the seedling-sapling stage and grass-forb stage. These recommendations should be reviewed in light of different ecological conditions within the basin.

Group 6—Vaux’s Swift, Williamson’s Sapsucker, Pileated Woodpecker, Hammond’s Flycatcher, Chestnut-Backed Chickadee, Brown Creeper, Winter Wren, Golden-Crowned Kinglet, Varied Thrush, Silver-Haired Bat, and Hoary Bat

Results

Species ranges, source habitats, and special habitat features—Group 6 consists of migratory breeding habitat for brown creepers, Hammond’s flycatchers, Vaux’s swifts, and Williamson’s sapsuckers; resident summer habitat for varied thrushes, winter wrens, silver-haired bats, and hoary bats; and year-round habitat for chestnut-backed chickadees, golden-crowned kinglets, and pileated woodpeckers. Ranges within the basin for the 11 species in this group (fig. 18) tend to fit one of four broad patterns. Silver-haired bats and hoary bats occur throughout the basin in forested areas or woodlands. Brown creepers, Hammond’s flycatchers, winter wrens, and golden-crowned kinglets generally occur throughout the forested areas of the basin. The range of Williamson’s sapsucker differs from these four species as it does not extend all the way to the crest of the Cascade Range or to the southern extremes of the Central Idaho Mountains or Upper Klamath ERUs. Pileated woodpeckers, varied thrushes, chestnut-backed chickadees, and Vaux’s swifts are distributed across forested areas in the western half of the basin, but their ranges do not extend to the southeastern portion of the Central Idaho Mountains below the Salmon River, or into the Snake Headwaters or Upper Snake ERUs.

Source habitats for the 11 species in group 6 are generally late-seral stages of the subalpine, montane, lower montane, and riparian woodland community groups (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Source habitats shared in common by more than one-half of the species are the old-forest single- and multi-strata stages of grand fir-white fir, interior Douglas-fir, western larch, western white pine, western redcedar-western hemlock, Sierra Nevada mixed conifer, and mountain hemlock; and the old-forest multi-strata stage of Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir, Pacific silver fir-mountain hemlock, and red fir (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Source habitats used by less than one-half the species include old-forest Pacific and interior ponderosa pine (used by brown creepers, Hammond’s flycatchers, Williamson’s sapsuckers, hoary bats, and silver-haired bats); old-forest whitebark pine and alpine larch (used by golden-crowned kinglets); and forest lodgepole pine (used by golden-crowned kinglets, Hammond’s flycatchers, hoary bats, and silver-haired bats); old-forest aspen (used by Williamson’s sapsuckers, chestnut-backed chickadees, Hammond’s flycatchers, hoary bats, and silver-haired bats); and old-forest cottonwood-willow (used by Williamson’s sapsuckers, hoary bats, and silver-haired bats) (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Hoary bats also use the stand initiation stage of all montane and lower montane forest types and of aspen and cottonwood-willow for foraging (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1).
Figure 18—Ranges of species in group 6 within the basin (from Marcot and others, in prep.). For species whose ranges shifted significantly from historical conditions, separate maps are shown for historical and current ranges; otherwise, the current range map also denotes the historical range.
Figure 18—Ranges of species in group 6 within the basin (from Marcot and others, in prep.). For species whose ranges shifted significantly from historical conditions, separate maps are shown for historical and current ranges; otherwise, the current range map also denotes the historical range.
Figure 18—Ranges of species in group 6 within the basin (from Marcot and others, in prep.). For species whose ranges shifted significantly from historical conditions, separate maps are shown for historical and current ranges; otherwise, the current range map also denotes the historical range.
Several special habitat features exist for species in this group (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2). Six of the bird species (brown creepers, chestnut-backed chickadees, pileated woodpeckers, Vaux’s swifts, Williamson’s sapsuckers, and winter wrens) depend on snags for nesting or roosting, or both (Bull and Hohmann 1993; Bull and others 1986a, 1992; Raphael and White 1984). Brown creepers, pileated woodpeckers, Vaux’s swifts, and Williamson’s sapsuckers use large (>53 cm [21 in] d.b.h.) snags (Bull and others 1986a, 1992; Bull and Hohmann 1993, Raphael and White 1984). Winter wrens and chestnut-backed chickadees use smaller diameter snags (Thomas and others 1979). Pileated woodpeckers forage on large snags and logs (Bull and Holthausen 1993, Mannan 1984), and winter wrens forage around and under logs (Van Horne and Bader 1990). Pileated woodpeckers and Vaux’s swifts depend on large, hollow live or dead trees for roosting (Bull 1991, Bull and others 1992).

Special habitat features for both bat species include shrub/herbaceous wetland/riparian areas (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2). Both species use contrasting habitats—forested areas for roosting and open areas for foraging. Snags are a special habitat feature for silver-haired bats. They roost in trees, snags, mines, caves, crevices, and buildings (Christy and West 1993). Day roost trees are usually characterized by being large (>53 cm [21 in] d.b.h.), dead or live with some defect, with loose bark and cracks. In an Oregon study, Betts (1996) found silver-haired bats roosting in live western larch and ponderosa pine, and in grand fir and ponderosa pine snags. The average diameter of these roost trees was 59.6 cm (23.5 in), and they were generally located on relatively densely forested slopes. The hoary bat is an edge-associated species, often roosting in deciduous trees or conifers at the edge of clearings (Perkins and Cross 1988, Shump and Shump 1982). Hoary bats are foliage roosters, with males, nonbreeding females, and breeding females located in different levels in the canopy (Christy and West 1993).

**Interpreting Results**

**Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats**—The projected decline in source habitats reflected basin-wide declines in late-seral forest conditions (USDA Forest Service 1996). Changes in late-seral forests, however, have differed among ERUs (tables 3.141 to 3.165 in Hann and others 1997). Late-seral montane multi-layer forests and late-seral subalpine multi-layer forests declined significantly in all six ERUs in which source habitats declined in more than 50 percent of watersheds; late-seral montane multi-layer forests declined in five of them; and late-seral lower montane single-layer forests declined in four of them (Hann and others 1997). Late-seral montane multi-layer and single-layer forests each increased significantly in three of the four ERUs (Southern Cascades, Upper Klamath, Northern Great Basin, and Columbia Plateau) in which source habitats increased in more than 50 percent of watersheds. Much of this change was due to shifts from shade-intolerant, late-seral lower montane forest types to shade-tolerant, late-seral montane forest types. The increase in the fourth ERU, the Columbia Plateau, appears to be somewhat anomalous. It was likely the result of a moderate increase in the open canopy stem-exclusion stage of interior ponderosa pine (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4), which serves as source habitat only for hoary bats (primarily foraging habitat).
Figure 19—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 6 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 20—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 6, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by n.
Condition of special habitat features—Snags are a special habitat feature for seven of the species in this group, and large hollow trees for two species. Densities of large-diameter (>53 cm [21 in] d.b.h.) snags likely have declined basin-wide from historical to current levels (Hann and others 1997, Hessburg and others 1999, Quigley and others 1996). Historical to current trends in smaller diameter snags were variable, with no clear basin-wide trend emerging (Hann and others 1997).

The number of caves available for roosts across the basin likely has stayed the same, and mines may now provide additional roost or hibernacula areas. Cave and mine suitability, however, can be affected by recreational use, such as cave exploration, which increases with higher road densities near caves. Historical road densities were lower than current densities. Road densities are high in intensively managed forest lands of both public and private ownership, and the highest densities typically occur in developed urban-rural areas (USDA Forest Service 1996, p. 85).

Across the basin, there were widespread declines in shrublands in riparian zones (USDA Forest Service 1996, p. 101). Forest conversion and streamside disturbances have degraded and fragmented riparian vegetation. This may have negatively impacted the shrub/herbaceous wetland/riparian foraging areas for the hoary and silver-haired bats.

Other factors affecting the group—Four of the species in this group (brown creepers, Hammond’s flycatchers, Vaux’s swifts, and Williamson’s sapsuckers) are Neotropical migrants and may be affected by habitat conditions on their wintering grounds. The bat species also are thought to winter outside the basin, although exact migration routes and winter ranges are not clear (Christy and West 1993).

Hoary bats eat moths, beetles, and mosquitoes (Barclay 1985, 1986; Rolseth and others 1994; Shump and Shump 1982; Whitaker and others 1977). The silver-haired bat is an opportunistic feeder and eats moths, flies, beetles, and various other insects (Whitaker and others 1981). Management activities such as the use of pesticides that cause declines of insect species may negatively affect these bats. Also, direct contact with pesticides can cause illness or death in bats. Although most organochlorine pesticides that cause accumulation of chemicals up the food chain have been banned or highly restricted in the United States, the relatively short-lived organophosphates can provide high risks during application (Clark 1988). For example, a large die-off of bats observed in Arizona after the application of methyl parathion, was believed to be linked to direct contact with the chemical (Clark 1988).

Grazing can have an adverse impact on the insect prey of bats (Clark 1988, Nagorsen and Brigham 1993, Perlmeter 1995, Ports and Bradley 1996). Roads also may facilitate harvest of snags for firewood and so may indirectly affect habitat for the species that use snags.

Population status and trends—Saab and Rich (1997) reported stable population trends, based on data from BBS routes within the basin, for Williamson’s sapsuckers, Vaux’s swifts, Hammond’s flycatchers, brown creepers, and golden-crowned kinglets. Breeding Bird Survey data analyzed within other geographic boundaries (Sauer and others 1996), however, indicate a significant decline from 1966 to 1994 for brown creepers in eastern Oregon and Washington (-7.4 percent per year, n = 15, P < 0.01). Breeding Bird Survey data also indicate a significant increase in pileated woodpeckers in northwestern Montana (6.1 percent per year, n = 41, P < 0.01, 1966 to 1994; Sauer and others 1996) but a significant decrease in eastern Oregon and Washington (-7.8 percent per year, n = 8, P < 0.05, 1966 to 1979; Sauer and others 1996). A significant increase is shown for winter wrens in eastern Oregon and Washington (7.8 percent per year, n = 9, P < 0.05, 1966 to 1979). Population data are not available for the bat species.

Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integrating potential resource objectives for group 6 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—The following issues were identified from our analysis of source habitat trends:

1. Reductions in the extent of late-seral lower montane, montane, and subalpine forest (Hann and others 1997), particularly in the Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork ERUs.
2. Reductions in large snags and logs in landscapes that have been managed under traditional silvicultural practices (Hann and others 1997).

3. Possibly unsustainable conditions in late-seral stage montane forests where there have been large transitions from shade-intolerant to shade-tolerant species.

4. Degradation and loss of riparian habitat.

5. Abandonment of bat roosts because of human disturbance.

6. Reductions in the insect prey base for bats because of both land management activities and the use of pesticides.

7. Negative effects of pesticide and insecticide spraying.

Potential strategies—The following strategies would benefit species in group 6:

1. (To address issues no. 1 and no. 2) Accelerate development of late-seral conditions in lower montane, montane, and subalpine forest types and retain large snags and logs in all forest seral stages. Habitat restoration efforts would be most beneficial if concentrated in the northern portions of the basin.

2. (To address issues nos. 1-3) In the southern portion of the basin, retain sufficient habitat to support species in this group while restoring forest conditions that are more resistant to catastrophic fire, insect, and disease problems. This could require management activities, including prescribed fire, that reduce the dominance of shade-tolerant tree species and increase the presence of shade-intolerant species (i.e., those most resistant to catastrophic fire and insect and disease problems).

3. (To address issue no. 4) Across the basin, maintain or improve riparian shrubland and riparian woodland communities.

4. (To address issues no. 2 and no. 5) Protect known and potential bat roosts across the basin. Specifically, maintain caves, mines, snags, and other such features for use as roosting areas and potential nurseries across the basin. Minimize human disturbance in these areas.

5. (To address issues no. 6 and no. 7) Minimize direct physiological effects on bats, as well as indirect effects on their insect prey, stemming from use of insecticides and pesticides.

6. (To address issues no. 6 and no. 7) Modify management practices as appropriate to enhance the insect prey base for bats.

Practices that support strategies—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategy no. 1) Various silvicultural practices including thinning, burning, and uneven-age management could be used to help accelerate the development of old-forest conditions.

2. (In support of strategies no. 1 and no. 2) Both the retention and creation of snags are important for retention and development of old-forest characteristics. Techniques for snag management are well studied (Bull and others 1980, Bull and Partridge 1986) and have been extensively applied on National Forests (Bull and others 1986b). Retain existing snags, particularly if >53 cm (21 in), and provide measures for snag replacement. Review existing snag guidelines or develop guidelines that reflect local ecological conditions and address snag numbers, diameter, height, decay class, species, and distribution. Consider closing roads in areas that are deficient of snags and where cutting of snags or remnant trees for firewood contributes to the low snag densities. In addition, or as an alternative to road management, actively enforce fuel wood regulations to minimize removal of large snags.

3. (In support of strategy no. 2) To continue meeting habitat needs of species in this group, habitat retention efforts should be designed to maintain an appropriate network of old-forest habitats. Bull and Holthausen (1993) suggested managing areas of 1000 ha (2,471 acres) to meet needs of multiple
pairs of pileated woodpeckers. Features of these areas were a substantial old forest and unlogged component, at least 8 snags per ha (3 snags per acre) with at least 20 percent of these >51 cm (20 in) d.b.h., and at least 100 logs per ha (40 logs per acre) with a preference for logs 38 cm (15 in) in diameter and larger. Such strategies could be coordinated with needs for ecosystem health by focusing old-forest retention areas in geographic locations where fire, insect, and disease risks are lowest.

4. (In support of strategy no. 3) Maintain or restore riparian vegetation around permanent and seasonal water sources.

5. (In support of strategy no. 4) Protect building roost sites. If possible, stabilize old structures that are important roosts.

6. (In support of strategy no. 6) Modify grazing practices to improve condition of degraded riparian areas for bat foraging.

---

Group 7—Boreal Owl

Results

Species ranges, source habitats, and special habitat features—Group 7 consists of the boreal owl. Within the basin, this species occurs in forested portions of eastern Washington, northern and central Idaho, western Montana, and the Blue Mountains and Cascade Range of Oregon (fig. 21). The boreal owl is a year-round resident of the basin.

Source habitats for boreal owls include old-forest and unmanaged young-forest stages of subalpine and montane forests and riparian woodlands (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Specific cover types and structural stages that provide source habitat are the old-forest multi-story stages of Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir, Pacific silver fir-mountain hemlock, and aspen; and the old forest single- and multi-forest stages of interior Douglas-fir, western larch, and lodgepole pine. Unmanaged young-forest stages of all these cover types and of grand fir-white fir also serve as

---

Figure 21—Ranges of species in group 7 within the basin (from Marcot and others, in prep.). For species whose ranges shifted significantly from historical conditions, separate maps are shown for historical and current ranges; otherwise, the current range map also denotes the historical range.
Source habitats if suitable large-diameter snags are present. Source habitats typically support abundant lichens and fungal sporocarps, which provide important foods for southern red-backed voles, the principal prey of boreal owls (Hayward 1994c). These lichens and fungi are associated with coarse woody debris.

Boreal owls require snags or large trees with either natural cavities or cavities excavated by other species (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2). Cavities excavated by pileated woodpeckers and northern flickers are the most common nest sites (Hayward 1994c). Tree and snag diameters used for nesting are generally large. For example, in Idaho, diameters of nest trees ranged from 26 to 61 cm (10 to 24 in) with an average of 41 cm (16 in). Of 19 nests, 10 were in snags whereas the remainder were in live trees (Hayward and others 1993).

At the home range scale, boreal owls are adapted to patchy landscapes and use several cover types and structural stages to meet different life history requirements (Hayward and others 1993). Landscapes that contain various old-forest cover types may support the greatest abundance of boreals (Hayward and others 1993). In portions of their range, boreal owls may occur in a patchy geographic pattern resulting in a metapopulation structure, with the long-term persistence of each population determined in part by its relation to other populations (Hayward 1994a).

**Broad-scale changes in source habitats**

Historically, the most concentrated areas of source habitat for boreal owls were in the Northern Cascades, Northern Glaciated Mountains, and Snake Headwaters ERUs (fig. 22A). Other ERUs that historically supported significant source habitat were the Southern Cascades, Lower Clark Fork, Upper Clark Fork, and Central Idaho Mountains ERUs.

Overall, source habitats were projected to have declined moderately or strongly in nearly 80 percent of the watersheds in the basin (fig. 23). Moderate or strong declines were projected for over 50 percent of watersheds in the Northern Cascades, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Upper Clark Fork, Lower Clark Fork, Snake Headwaters, and Central Idaho Mountains ERUs (fig. 23). Moderate or strong declines in over 50 percent of watersheds also were projected for the Columbia Plateau and Upper Snake, but these ERUs are peripheral to the range of boreal owls. Source habitats were projected to have increased moderately or strongly in over 50 percent of watersheds in the Southern Cascades, and there was a mixed pattern of change in the Blue Mountains ERU (fig. 23).

These trends have resulted in a broad shift in the geographic distribution of source habitats away from the northern ERUs and towards the central portions of the basin. Habitat losses have outweighed the gains, and current habitat distribution is substantially more disjunct than historically in the northern part of the basin (fig. 22).

**Interpreting Results**

**Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats**—Across the northern portion of the basin, the trend in forest structure has been an increase in mid-seral stages at the expense of both early- and late-seral stages (Hann and others 1997). Ecologically significant declines (Hann and others 1997) were projected for late-seral montane multi-story and single-story forests for the Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork ERUs. Late-seral subalpine multi-story forests also were projected to have declined significantly in two of these ERUs (Hann and others 1997). Specific habitat types for which there was greatest decline in areal extent within the three northern ERUs were western larch, interior Douglas-fir, and Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir old forests (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4).

In the Southern Cascades, the source habitats that increased most strongly were single-storied old-forest Douglas-fir and multi-storied old-forest lodgepole pine (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). Increases in source habitats in portions of the Blue Mountains were associated largely with increases in multi-storied old-forests of Douglas-fir. In the Central Idaho Mountains ERU, the source habitats that decreased most in areal extent were old-forest single- and multi-storied Douglas-fir (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4).

**Condition of special habitat features**—Densities of large-diameter snags and trees (>53 cm [21 in] d.b.h.) declined basin-wide from historical to current levels (Hann and others 1997, Hessburg and others 1999, Quigley and others 1996). Historical trends in smaller diameter snags were extremely variable (Hann and others 1997), so the overall basin-wide trend is unclear.
Figure 22—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 7 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥ 60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥ 20 percent but < 60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of < 20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥ 20 percent but < 60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥ 60 percent.
Figure 23—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 7, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by n.
Other factors affecting species within the group—
Cavity availability is dependent on the presence of primary excavators, most notably the pileated woodpecker and northern flicker (Hayward 1994c). Changes in population levels of these and other cavity excavators could affect boreal owl nesting opportunities.

Changes in forest structure could alter habitat suitability for voles and other important prey species and affect population levels of these species. In particular, changes in the abundance of coarse woody debris, snags, lichens, and fungi could significantly alter habitat suitability for many species found in older structural stages. This could affect the food resource for boreal owls and have a direct bearing on reproductive success.

Population status and trends—No reliable estimates of boreal owl population densities or trends in North America are available (Hayward 1994c).

Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integration of potential resource objectives for group 7 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—The following issues have been identified as potentially influencing boreal owl conservation:

1. Declines in late-seral subalpine and montane forests, particularly in the Northern Cascades, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, Upper Clark Fork, and Snake Headwaters ERUs.

2. Declines in large aspen trees and forests primarily because of fire suppression. Hayward and others (1993) found a relatively high use of aspen for nesting compared to available habitats.

3. Increasingly disjunct distribution of source habitats that may affect population structure (Hayward 1994a, 1997) and persistence of boreal owls.

4. Loss of large-diameter snags (>45 cm [18 in] d.b.h. recommended by Hayward [1994a]).

5. Loss of microenvironments for small-mammal prey. Changes in forest structure and composition (such as loss of snags and logs) could alter habitat for primary prey species (Hayward 1994a).

Potential strategies—The following strategies can be used to address the issues listed above:

1. (To address issue no. 1) Maintain existing habitats and accelerate development of subalpine and montane old-forest conditions within stands that are currently in mid-seral structural stages, particularly in the Northern Glaciated Mountains, Upper Clark Fork, and Lower Clark Fork ERUs.

2. (To address issue no. 2) Restore aspen forests throughout the basin where they have been reduced. This is particularly important in areas where aspen provides most of the nesting habitat for boreal owls (Hayward 1997).

3. (To address issue no. 3) Provide adequate links among subpopulations. Evaluate the links among subpopulations and use that information to identify areas that are highest priority for retention and restoration of habitat. This is of particular concern in the Northern Glaciated Mountains, Upper Clark Fork, and Lower Clark Fork ERUs, where reduction in the extent of source habitats has increased the isolation of remaining habitat patches.

4. (To address issues no. 4 and no. 5) Retain large-diameter snags in all source habitats and provide for snag replacement over time.

5. (To address issue no. 5) Include boreal owl conservation within a larger, ecosystem context that addresses management of primary cavity nesters, small mammals, and forest structural components (Hayward 1994a).

Practices that support strategies—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategy no. 1) Adjust management activities to maintain and restore source habitats, particularly in the northern ERUs. Avoid extensive use of clearcuts, which may reduce habitat quality for 100 to 200 years (Hayward 1997). Small patch
cuits implemented on long rotations may be compatible with maintenance of habitat quality for boreal owls (Hayward 1997). Thinning from below may provide for development of nest structures.

2. (In support of strategy no. 2) Use clearcutting to regenerate aspen, focusing on the maintenance, at a landscape scale, of large aspen that provide nesting habitat for boreal owls (Hayward 1997). Where aspen regeneration is inhibited by domestic or wild ungulate browsing, use exclosures to protect regenerating stands and modify management to reduce browsing pressure.

3. (In support of strategy no. 4) Determine potential snag densities for each cover type used as source habitats by conducting surveys within remote areas, reserves, and natural areas. Use these baseline data to determine whether snags are below potential in other areas. Provide measures for snag protection and recruitment in all timber harvest plans.

**Group 8—Great Gray Owl**

**Results**

**Species ranges, source habitats, and special habitat features**—Group 8 consists of breeding habitat for the great gray owl, a year-round resident of the basin. Great gray owls are distributed holarctically across the boreal forests of North America and Eurasia; they also inhabit other forest types at the southern extent of their range within the United States (Duncan and Hayward 1994). Within the basin, the great gray owl is widely distributed, although at low population levels, across most forested areas (fig. 24).

Within the basin, source habitats for great gray owls are old-forest, unmanaged young forest, and stand-initiation stages of montane forests, Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir, and riparian woodlands (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Shrub or herb-tree regeneration also provide source habitats (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Source habitats in the stand-initiation stage and herb-tree regeneration are used primarily for foraging. Old and unmanaged young forests are used for nesting and roosting, and more open stands (11 to 59 percent canopy cover [Bull and Henjum 1990]) are used for foraging. Great gray owls are a contrast species, requiring the juxtaposition of habitats used for foraging and for nesting and roosting (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2).

Snags are a special habitat feature for great gray owls (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2). They do not build their own nests but rely on existing platforms such as stick nests originally created by other birds or formed by dwarf mistletoe brooms, depressions in broken-topped dead trees, stumps, or artificial platforms (Bull and Henjum 1990, Duncan 1992, Mikkola 1983, Nero 1980). In one study in northeastern Oregon (Bull and Henjum 1990), 51 percent of the nests were stick platforms, 29 percent were on artificial platforms, and 20 percent were in natural depressions on broken-topped dead trees (n = 49). Of the stick nests, 68 percent were made by northern goshawks, 12 percent made by red-tailed hawks, and 20 percent were natural platforms formed by dwarf mistletoe brooms. Large branches are needed to support large stick-nests averaging 74 cm (29 in) long, 65 cm (26 in) wide, and 27 cm (11 in) high (Bull and Henjum 1990), and nests in broken-topped trees must be wide enough to accommodate a family of owls. Such trees range from 46 to 94 cm (18 to 37 in) in d.b.h. (Bull and Henjum 1990).

**Broad-scale change in source habitats**—Historically, source habitats for the great gray owl presumably were broadly distributed throughout forested portions of the basin (fig. 25A). The greatest concentrations of habitat were in the northern portion of the basin in the Northern Cascades, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, Upper Clark Fork, and Snake Headwaters ERUs (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 3). Source habitat is projected to have declined moderately or strongly in 50 percent of watersheds basin-wide, and to have increased moderately or strongly in nearly 40 percent of watersheds (fig. 26). Although the overall change in source habitat has not been great, there has been a significant shift in its geographic distribution with habitat becoming more extensive in the western and central portions of the basin and less abundant in the northeastern part (fig. 25C). Of the ERUs that support substantial source habitat, moderate or strong increases in more than 50 percent of watersheds were projected for the Southern Cascades, Upper Klamath, Blue Mountains, and Central Idaho Mountains. Decreases in more than 50 percent of watersheds were projected for the Columbia Plateau, Northern Glaciated
Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, Upper Clark Fork, and Snake Headwaters (fig. 26). Mixed trends were projected for the Northern Cascades ERU.

Interpreting Results

Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats—The increase in habitat in the Southern Cascades, Upper Klamath, and Blue Mountains was primarily attributed to an increase in late-seral montane forests (Hann and others 1997). In the Blue Mountains, an increase in the stand-initiation structural stage also contributed to the increase in source habitats. In the Northern Cascades, increases in source habitats primarily were due to an increase in early-seral montane forests. Habitat also has increased in the Central Idaho Mountains where the increasing trend is primarily the result of an increase in late-seral multi-layer and early-seral montane forests.

In the ERUs where habitat for this species has declined (primarily the northern and eastern parts of the basin), habitat loss can be attributed primarily to the substantial reduction in late-seral montane and subalpine forests and early-seral montane forests (Hann and others 1997). The only exception is the Columbia Plateau, where source habitats declined primarily because of the reduction in abundance of shrub or herb-tree regeneration habitat (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). In all of the ERUs where source habitats are projected to have declined, there has been a significant increase in managed mid-seral montane forests since the historical period (Hann and others 1997).

Our evaluation at the broad-scale did not assess the distribution of foraging habitat in relation to that for nesting habitat. Further analysis of the juxtaposition of foraging with nesting habitats is needed at a finer scale of resolution. Average breeding home range size of individual adult great gray owls has been calculated as 4.5 km² (1.7 mi²) (Bull and Henjum 1990) and 2.6 km² (1.0 mi²) (Craighead and Craighead 1956), and...
Figure 25—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 8 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 26—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 8, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by n.
the ranges of adults are overlapping (Bull and Henjum 1990). Within each home range, a mixture of foraging and nesting habitat is needed. Analyses completed for the basin do not reveal landscape patterns at the scale of individual home ranges. Results for source habitats shown here for both the current and historical time periods are likely overestimates as they do not take into account the need for juxtaposition of habitats.

Condition of special habitat features—According to the landscape assessment (Hann and others 1997), the forests of the current period are more homogeneous than historical forests. Old-forest structures, remnant large trees, and the presence of medium to large trees in all forest structural classes have been reduced (Hann and others 1997). Densities of large-diameter snags (>53 cm [21 in] d.b.h.) likely declined basin-wide from historical to current levels (Quigley and others 1996, USDA Forest Service 1996). Presumably, the overall loss in large and medium trees and snag structures has reduced the availability of nest sites for great gray owls.

Other factors affecting the group—An additional factor may be the use of poisons to control pocket gopher populations. Such programs likely reduce the prey base for great gray owls (Hayward 1994b).

Population status and trends—No long-term, rigorous, or standardized surveys have been done of great gray owl populations within the basin (Duncan and Hayward 1994).

Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integration of potential resource objectives for group 8 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—The following issues were derived from the analysis of source habitats and from published literature.

1. Decline of late- and early-seral stages of montane and subalpine forests, particularly in the northern and eastern parts of the basin.

2. Decline in availability of large trees and snags in all seral stages of montane and subalpine forests.

3. Encroachment of conifers into natural meadow systems, eliminating potential foraging habitat.

4. Reduced duration of early-seral stages because of intensive planting and thinning.

5. Decline in prey resulting from use of poisons to control pocket gophers.

Potential strategies—Habitat for great gray owls would benefit from the following strategies that address the issues listed above:

1. (To address issue no. 1) Conserve existing older forest that is considered source habitat for this species, particularly in the Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork. The older forests that are source habitats for great gray owls have greater likelihood of being used for nesting if such stands are near open or early forests, which are used for foraging.

2. (To address issue no. 1) Accelerate the development of old-forest conditions in existing mid-seral stands.

3. (To address issue no. 2) Maintain and recruit large (>50 cm [20 in] d.b.h.) (Bull and Henjum 1990) live trees and snags for potential nesting strata.

4. (To address issue no. 3) Maintain and restore natural meadow systems that are adjacent to or near areas of old forest and have nesting platforms for great gray owls.

5. (To address issues no. 1 and no. 4) Maintain a spatial and temporal mix of nesting (late-seral) and foraging (early-seral) habitats. Continuity of foraging habitat must be maintained through prudent long-term planning of timber harvest and other forest management activities.

6. (To address issues no. 1 and no. 2) In evaluating and managing for long-term habitat quality, consider factors that influence populations of nest-building species (goshawk, red-tailed hawks, and ravens) and tree pathogen-insect interactions that can influence branch development (dwarf mistletoe brooms).
7. (To address issue no. 5) Avoid the use of poisons to control pocket-gopher populations near nesting habitat for great gray owls.

**Practices that support strategies**—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategy no. 1) Focus retention efforts for late-seral montane and subalpine forests on sites where risks of catastrophic loss are relatively low.

2. (In support of strategy no. 2) Use prescribed burning and precommercial thinning to accelerate the development of old-forest conditions in mid-seral stands.

3. (In support of strategy no. 3) Maintain and restore natural meadow systems with the use of prescribed burning and removal of encroaching conifers.

4. (In support of strategy no. 3) Close roads to minimize removal of snags where such removals are reducing habitat quality for great gray owls. In addition or as an alternative to road management, actively enforce fuel wood regulations to minimize removal of large snags.

**Group 9—Black-Backed Woodpecker**

**Results**

**Species ranges, source habitats, and special habitat features**—The black-backed woodpecker is a year-round resident that occurs in various forest types throughout the basin, except in southern Idaho ERUs (fig. 27). Source habitats of the black-backed woodpecker include old-forest stages of subalpine, montane, and lower montane forests and riparian woodlands (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Both managed and unmanaged young-forest stages of lodgepole pine also provide source habitat (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1).
Burned conifer forests (Caton 1996, Hoffman 1997, Hutto 1995, Marshall 1992, Saab and Dudley 1998) and other insect-infested forests (Goggans and others 1988) provide key conditions necessary for both nesting and foraging. Habitat requirements for nesting include mature and old trees infested with disease or heart rot, or in early stages of decay (Goggans and others 1988). This species forages almost exclusively on the larvae of bark beetles (Scolytidae) and wood-boring beetles (Cerambycidae and Buprestridae) (Marshall 1992), which are obtained from tree trunks by scaling or flaking bark (Bull and others 1986a) and by excavating logs and the base of large-diameter tree trunks (Villard 1994). Thus, black-backed woodpeckers require conditions that produce bark and wood-boring beetle sources, including fire-, wind- or insect-killed mature or old pines, and other trees that have flaky bark (Dixon and Saab, in prep.; Marshall 1992). Both live and dead trees are used for foraging. Once trees have dried out 2 to 3 yr after mortality, bark beetles decline, and use by this woodpecker also declines (Bull 1980). Populations are irruptive in response to bark beetle outbreaks in recently fire-killed forest stands or where trees become susceptible to bark beetle attacks through maturity (Baldwin 1968, Blackford 1955, Lester 1980).

In the northern Rockies, early postfire conditions (1 to 5 yr after fire) are critical for supporting populations (Hutto 1995). Black-backed woodpecker abundance was not correlated to burn size but best correlated to the number of small snags remaining after fire in the northern Rockies (Hutto 1995). Summer home ranges for single birds differ in size from 72 to 328 ha (178 to 810 acres), depending on the quality of habitat (Goggans and others 1988). Goggans and others (1988) estimated that a single black-backed woodpecker requires an area of 193 ha (477 acres) of which 59 percent should be mature to old-forest conditions. They also suggested that a minimum management area for a nesting pair in mixed-coniferous and lodgepole forests should be 387 ha (956 acres) of mature or old-forest conditions.

Snags are a special habitat feature for black-backed woodpeckers (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2). Nest cavities are excavated in live trees with heart rot or recently killed trees (dead < 5 yr). This species nests in ponderosa pine, lodgepole pine, and western larch trees in the Blue Mountains (Bull and others 1986a). In central Oregon, they nested in mixed-coniferous and lodgepole forests that were undergoing a mountain pine beetle outbreak (Goggans and others 1988). Selection for mature and old stands was reported in central Oregon based on nest, foraging, and roost sites (Goggans and others 1988). Nesting birds favor unlogged compared to salvage logged stands of burned forests in western Idaho (Saab and Dudley 1998) and western Montana (Caton 1996). Black-backed woodpeckers generally select relatively small-diameter trees for nesting compared with other cavity nesters of similar size. In the Blue Mountains, mean d.b.h. of nest trees was 37 cm (14.6 in) (n = 15), and trees were generally tall (>15 m [49 ft]) and recently dead (<5 yr) (Bull and others 1986a). The mean d.b.h. of nest trees in central Oregon was 28 cm (11 in) (n = 35) (Goggans and others 1988). In burned ponderosa pine forests of western Idaho, nest tree d.b.h. averaged 32 cm (12.6 in) (n = 17), nest trees had relatively light decay, nest sites were located in tree clumps, and tree (>23 cm [9 in] d.b.h.) densities surrounding nests averaged 125 per ha (51 per acre) (104 per ha [42 per acre]) in logged and 151 per ha [61 per acre] in unlogged units [Saab and Dudley 1998]).

In an Oregon forest with a bark beetle epidemic, overall nesting success averaged 68.5 percent (n = 19 nests) (Goggans and others 1988). In contrast, nest success was 100 percent for nests monitored in burned forests of western Idaho (n = 27) (Saab and Dudley 1998) and northwestern Wyoming (n = 14) (Hoffman 1997). Nest losses in Oregon were attributed to predation by flying squirrels and Douglas squirrels (Goggans and others 1988). Few mammalian nest predators were observed recolonizing the large-scale burns of western Idaho or the burns in northwestern Wyoming during the first 3 yr after fire (Dixon and Saab, in prep.). This suggests that large burned forests during early postfire years are potentially important source habitats for black-backed woodpecker.

**Broad-scale changes in source habitats**—The following analysis does not account for recently burned habitats that are likely important as source habitats for black-backed woodpeckers. Such areas are generally at too fine a scale, and too ephemeral, to have been reliably estimated in the landscape analysis.

Historically, source habitats for black-backed woodpeckers were broadly distributed throughout the range of the species within the basin (fig. 28A). The most concentrated areas of habitat occurred in portions of the Blue Mountains, Columbia Plateau, Upper Klamath, Southern Cascades, Northern Cascades, and Central Idaho Mountains ERUs (fig. 28A).
Figure 28—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 9 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 29—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 9, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of >20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of >20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by n.
The current distribution of source habitats is more concentrated in the southern half of the basin and diminished in the northern half. The Upper Klamath, Southern Cascades, Blue Mountains, southern watersheds of the Columbia Plateau, and the Central Idaho Mountains currently support the greatest concentrations of habitat (fig. 28B). In contrast, source habitats in the northern portion of the basin are scarcer and less well distributed than historically (fig. 28B).

Moderate or strong declines in source habitats were projected in nearly 70 percent of watersheds throughout the basin, with moderate or strong increases in 23 percent of watersheds (fig. 29). The most widespread declines were in the northern and far eastern parts of the basin (fig. 28). Moderate or strong declines were projected in over 90 percent of watersheds within the Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower and Upper Clark Forks, and Snake Headwaters ERUs (fig. 29). Moderate or strongly declining trends also were projected for over 50 percent of watersheds in the Northern Cascades, Columbia Plateau, and Blue Mountains ERUs. Moderately or strongly increasing trends were projected for the Upper Klamath ERU. More mixed trends were projected for remaining ERUs.

**Interpreting Results**

**Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats**—Source habitat declined in more than 50 percent of watersheds in seven ERUs—the Northern Cascades, Columbia Plateau, Blue Mountains, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, Upper Clark Fork, and Snake Headwaters. In all but one of these (Snake Headwaters), ecologically significant declines occurred in late-seral lower montane forests (Hann and others 1997). In addition, there were also significant declines in late-seral montane forests in the three ERUs in the north end of the basin where source habitats declined most dramatically (Northern Glaciated Mountains, Upper Clark Fork, and Lower Clark Fork) (Hann and others 1997). The declines in the Snake Headwaters resulted from declines in both montane and subalpine late-seral forests (Hann and others 1997). Increases in the Upper Klamath ERU were due to increases in both lower montane and montane late-seral forest (Hann and others 1997).

**Condition of special habitat features**—Basin-wide declines from historical to current conditions were estimated for late-seral forest stands and for large snags (USDA Forest Service 1996) as well as for medium and large trees in all forest structural classes (Hann and others 1997). Based on these declines a decline in medium to large snags (23 to 53 cm d.b.h. [9 to 21 in]) is a reasonable assumption (see Quigley and others 1996 and USDA Forest Service 1996).

**Other factors affecting the group**—The natural pattern of beetle outbreaks has been altered through silvicultural practices and fire management policies. Silvicultural practices directed at maximizing wood production by harvesting trees before they are susceptible to bark beetle attacks, and salvage logging of beetle-infested, fire-killed, and wind-killed trees reduced the occurrence of beetles in some areas. Elsewhere, fire management policies have lengthened natural fire regimes and allowed more frequent occurrences of beetles.

Road densities have increased significantly throughout the basin (Hann and others 1997), thereby allowing greater human access into forested regions and subsequent increases in snag removal for firewood.

Usurpation of nest cavities by hairy woodpeckers (Goggans and others 1988) and by Lewis’ woodpeckers (Saab and Dudley 1995) negatively affects black-backed woodpeckers. Stress and elevated energetic costs associated with territorial encounters with hairy and Lewis’ woodpeckers potentially reduce reproductive success of black-backed woodpeckers.

**Population status and change**—Breeding Bird Surveys indicate that population trends from 1966 to 1995 have been stable within western North America ($n = 16$ routes) (Sauer and others 1996). Trend data generated by the BBS, however, may be inadequate for monitoring populations of black-backed woodpeckers because of their relatively uncommon status and because the species is often difficult to detect (Goggans and others 1988, Marshall 1992).
Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integrating potential resource objectives for group 9 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—The following issues were developed from our analysis of source habitat trends and findings from other studies:

1. Decline of old forests, particularly in the northern portion of the basin.

2. Decline in availability of medium to large (23 to 53 cm [9 to 21 in]) trees and snags infected with bark beetles, disease, or heart rot, or in the early stages of decay.

3. Decline in availability of large (>387 ha [956 acre]) forest stands with bark beetle outbreaks because of salvage logging, particularly in the northern basin.

4. Altered frequency of stand-replacing fires.

Potential strategies—The issues identified above suggest the following broad-scale strategies would be effective in facilitating the long-term persistence of the black-backed woodpecker.

1. (To address issue no. 1) Maintain existing old forests that include interior ponderosa pine, interior Douglas-fir, western larch, lodgepole pine, grand fir-white fir, Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir, aspen, and red fir cover types over the short term. Accelerate development of old-forest conditions in stands that are currently in mid- or early-seral stages. Maintenance and restoration of old forests is especially important within the range of this species where declines in old forests have been most pronounced. Areas of emphasis include Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork ERUs.

2. (To address issue no. 2) Where suitable nesting and foraging trees and snags are limited, retain mature and old trees and snags susceptible to bark beetle infestations, disease, and heart rot, or in the early stages of decay.

3. (To address issue no. 3) Throughout the ranges of the species, manage watersheds to maintain foraging and nesting habitat, with the location of that habitat shifting through time. Maintain stands that have experienced beetle outbreaks and stand-replacing burns.

4. (To address issue no. 4) Restore fire as an ecological process in montane and lower montane forests.

Practices that support strategies—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategy no. 1) Use silvicultural treatments of prescribed underburning and thinning only of small-diameter trees (<25 cm [10 in] d.b.h.) to accelerate development of mid-successional stages to old forests, particularly in cover types of ponderosa pine, Douglas-fir, and western larch.

2. (In support of strategy no. 2) Develop guidelines for retention of existing snags (>25 cm [10 in] d.b.h.) in all forests, especially those with recent stand-replacement fire, insects, and disease to lengthen the time that those stands are suitable for nesting by black-backed woodpecker. Close roads, particularly after postfire salvage, to minimize removal of snags for firewood. In addition, or as an alternative to road management, actively enforce fuel wood regulations to minimize removal of large snags.

3. (In support of strategy no. 2) Develop measures for snag recruitment in unburned forests. Snag recruitment in unburned forests, with high risks of stand-replacing fires, will provide nest trees during the first few years after wildfire.

4. (In support of strategy no. 3) Maintain some large (>387 ha [956 acre]) forest stands with bark beetle outbreaks for 5 yr, when beetle occupancy diminishes.

5. (In support of strategy no. 3) Avoid postfire salvage logging in portions of large burned forests to maintain contiguous burned stands of at least 387 ha [956 acres].
6. (In support of strategy no. 3) Where postfire salvage logging is planned in burned, lower montane forests, retain snags in clumps rather than evenly spaced distributions and retain at least 104 snags per ha (42 per acre), of d.b.h. >23 cm (9 in).

7. (In support of strategies no. 3 and no. 4) Allow wildfires to burn in some forests with high fire risk to produce stand-replacing conditions, and avoid postfire salvage logging in portions of large burned forests for about 5 yr postfire.

Group 10—Olive-Sided Flycatcher

Results

Species range, source habitats, and special habitat features—Group 10 consists of migratory breeding habitat for olive-sided flycatchers. Their range within the basin extends throughout forested areas (fig. 30).

Winter range for olive-sided flycatchers includes the Central American highlands, the Andes, and the Amazon (Willis and others 1993a).

Olive-sided flycatchers are a contrast species using coniferous old forests for nesting and either openings or gaps in old forests for foraging (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2; Sharp 1992). Their source habitats are old-forest single- and multi-storied and stand-initiation stages of subalpine, montane, and lower montane forests. Specific cover types that serve as source habitat are Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir, interior Douglas-fir, red fir, grand fir-white fir, Sierra Nevada mixed conifer, and Pacific ponderosa pine. Olive-sided flycatchers are positively associated with recent burns (Hejl 1994).

Broad-scale changes in source habitats—The extent of source habitat for olive-sided flycatchers is substantial in nine ERUs: the Northern Cascades, Southern Cascades, Upper Klamath, Blue Mountains, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, Upper Clark Fork, Snake Headwaters, and Central Idaho Mountains (fig. 31B). Basin-wide, the trend in source habitat for
Figure 31—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 10 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 32—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 10, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by n.
olive-sided flycatchers is nearly neutral, with source habitats increasing and decreasing in almost equal numbers of watersheds (fig. 32). Trends differed geographically with habitat decreasing moderately or strongly in more than 50 percent of watersheds in three ERUs in the northern basin (Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork) and increasing moderately or strongly in more than 50 percent of watersheds in three ERUs in the southern basin (Southern Cascades, Upper Klamath, and Blue Mountains) (fig. 32). Trends were more mixed in the remaining three ERUs with significant source habitat (fig. 32).

Interpreting Results

Composition and structure associated with changes in source habitats—Increases in late-seral montane forests (Hann and others 1997) were consistent across the three ERUs (Southern Cascades, Upper Klamath, and Blue Mountains), with increasing trends in more than 50 percent of watersheds. The greatest contributors to the increases were old-forest single-storied interior Douglas-fir and grand fir-white fir in the Southern Cascades; old-forest single- and multi-storied interior Douglas-fir in the Upper Klamath; and old-forest multi-storied interior Douglas-fir and grand fir-white fir in the Blue Mountains (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). For the three ERUs with decreasing trends in more than 50 percent of watersheds (Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork), consistent decreases occurred in early seral lower montane and montane forests; late-seral lower montane and montane multi-layered and single-layered forests; and late-seral subalpine multi-layered forests (Hann and others 1997).

Condition of special habitat features—Changes in fire regimes (Hann and others 1997) likely have resulted in poorer habitat conditions for olive-sided flycatchers, but the magnitude of the change is unknown. Where altered fire regimes result in fewer but larger fires, it seems likely that the juxtaposition of the early- and late-seral habitats used by olive-sided flycatchers becomes less favorable. Likewise, decreases in both early- and late-seral forests in the Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork likely have resulted in a strong decrease in areas of contrasting habitat condition used by olive-sided flycatchers. Our evaluation at the broad scale, however, did not assess the distribution of foraging habitat in relation to that for nesting habitat. Further analysis of the juxtaposition of foraging with nesting habitats is needed at a finer scale of resolution.

Other factors affecting the group—Marshall (1988) suggests that changes in winter habitats have negatively affected olive-sided flycatchers.

Population status and trends—Breeding Bird Survey data indicate a significant decline from 1966 to 1994 for olive-sided flycatchers in eastern Oregon and Washington (-2.5 percent per yr, n = 25, P < 0.01) (Sauer and others 1996). Saab and Rich (1997) reported significant 10-yr and 26-yr declines (4.2 percent per year and 2.9 percent per year, respectively) for flycatchers on BBS routes within the basin. They included the olive-sided flycatcher as one of 15 Neotropical migrants in the basin that are of high concern under all future management themes.

Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integrating potential resource objectives for group 10 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—The following issues were identified from our analysis of source habitat trends:

1. Reductions in early- and late-seral subalpine, montane, and lower montane forests, particularly in the Northern Glaciated Mountains and Upper and Lower Clark Forks.

2. Changes in fire regimes that result in fewer, larger, and more destructive fires, thereby reducing the areas of juxtaposed early- and late-seral forests.

Potential strategies—The following strategies would benefit species in group 10:

1. (To address issue no. 1) Accelerate development of late-seral conditions in lower montane, montane, and subalpine forests, particularly in the Northern Glaciated Mountains and the Upper and Lower Clark Fork.
(To address issues no. 1 and no. 2) Increase the amounts of early-seral lower montane and montane forests, focusing on early-seral conditions that result from fire. Such restoration efforts would be most beneficial if concentrated in the northern portions of the basin.

Practices that support strategies—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategies no. 1 and no. 2) Various silvicultural practices including thinning from below, burning, and uneven-age management could be used to help accelerate the development of old-forest conditions and the juxtaposition of early- and late-seral habitats used by olive-sided flycatchers.

Group 11—Three-Toed Woodpecker and White-Winged Crossbill

Results

Species ranges, source habitats, and special habitat features—Group 11 consists of the three-toed woodpecker and white-winged crossbill, both of which occur at upper elevations throughout the basin. The range of the three-toed woodpecker is somewhat broader than that of the crossbill, occupying a greater portion of western Montana and central Oregon (fig. 33). The three-toed woodpecker is a year-round resident of the basin, whereas the white-winged crossbill is primarily a winter migrant, although occasional summer flocks have been observed (Harrington-Tweit and Mattocks 1985).

Source habitats for group 11 are late-seral subalpine and montane forests. Source habitats shared in common by the two species are old forests of lodgepole pine, grand fir-white fir, and Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir. The three-toed woodpecker also uses white-bark pine and mountain hemlock, and the white-winged crossbill occurs in western larch and Pacific silver fir-mountain hemlock (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1).

Specific habitats used by the three-toed woodpecker are mature and overmature stands with bark beetles, disease, and heart rot (Goggans and others 1988) and recent stand-replacing burns with abundant wood-boring insects (Caton 1996, Hutto 1995). Three-toed woodpeckers forage predominantly on wood-boring beetle larvae (Stallcup 1962) and are attracted to areas with high concentrations of beetles, particularly in spruce and lodgepole pine (Bock and Bock 1974, Hogstad 1976, Villard 1994). Snags, a special habitat feature used for nesting (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2), generally fall within the diameter range of 22 to 50 cm (9 to 20 in) (Bull 1980, Lester 1980). Because snags are used for foraging as well as nesting, large burns and beetle-infested stands are strongly favored for breeding over unburned or noninfested stands (Caton 1996, Goggans and others 1988). The period when burns and beetle-infested stands are useful for foraging is limited to about 5 yr, because beetles no longer use snags after they have dried out (Bull 1980). For nesting, however, the presence of heartrot may be required for cavity excavation (Goggans and others 1988), and fire-killed conifers generally do not develop this stage of decay until more than 5 yr postfire (Caton 1996). Older snags within burns or beetle outbreaks generally satisfy nesting requirements.

Crossbills are highly dependent on conifer cone crops and congregate where seed production is locally abundant (Benkman 1992). The initiation of reproduction is triggered by abundance of conifer seeds. Nesting has been recorded every month of the year and occurs whenever the seed intake rate is sufficient for egg formation in females (Benkman 1990).

Broad-scale changes in source habitats—Trends in habitat availability for group 11 differ geographically. Historically, source habitats likely were distributed throughout most of the mountainous regions of the basin but generally occupied <25 percent of any given watershed (fig. 34A). Current source habitats seem to have roughly the same geographic distribution, but the amount of habitat in the northern portion of the ranges of the species generally declined, whereas habitat in the south increased (fig. 34B). Basin-wide, source habitats increased moderately or strongly in 38 percent of the watersheds and decreased moderately or strongly in 54 percent (fig. 35). The ERUs that support significant amounts of habitat for the group and had moderately or strongly increasing trends in more than 50 percent of watersheds were the Southern Cascades, Upper Klamath, Blue Mountains, and Central Idaho Mountains (fig. 35). The ERUs for which moderate or strong declines were projected in more than 50 percent
Figure 33—Ranges of species in group 11 within the basin (from Marcot and others, in prep.). For species whose ranges shifted significantly from historical conditions, separate maps are shown for historical and current ranges; otherwise, the current range map also denotes the historical range.
Figure 34—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 11 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 35—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 11, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of $\geq 60$ percent; 1 = an increase of $\geq 20$ percent but $< 60$ percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of $< 20$ percent; -1 = a decrease of $\geq 20$ percent but $< 60$ percent; and -2 = a decrease of $\geq 60$ percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by $n$. 
of watersheds were the Northern Cascades, the Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, Upper Clark Fork, and the Snake Headwaters (fig. 35).

Interpreting Results

Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats—Ecologically significant increases were projected by Hann and others (1997) for late-seral montane forests in all four ERUs in which source habitat increased in more than 50 percent of watersheds. For the five ERUs for which source habitats were projected to decline in more than 50 percent of watersheds, ecologically significant declines were projected in late-seral subalpine forests in the Northern Cascades; for late-seral montane forests in the Lower Clark Fork; and for both late-seral subalpine and late-seral montane forests in the Northern Glaciated Mountains, Upper Clark Fork, and Snake Headwaters.

Condition of special habitat features—Trends in snag availability within group 11 source habitats are unknown at the broad scale. Densities of large-diameter snags (>53 cm [21 in] d.b.h.) likely declined basin-wide from historical to current levels (Quigley and others 1996). The trend in smaller snags (22 to 50 cm [9 to 21 in]) used by three-toed woodpeckers is, however, unknown.

Other factors affecting the group—Three-toed woodpeckers are adapted to shifting their foraging areas to coincide with high concentrations of woodboring beetles (Koplin 1969). Availability of this shifting food resource could be affected by salvage logging of large burns and beetle-infested stands, and maintenance of conifer stands in vigorous condition through silvicultural thinning.

Population status and trends—There are insufficient sightings in the BBS data records to determine population trends for either white-winged crossbills or three-toed woodpeckers within the basin. Summarized across the West, however, three-toed woodpecker occurrences on 14 BBS routes have declined an average of 0.7 percent annually between 1966 and 1995 ($n = 14, P < 0.05$; Sauer and others 1996).

Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integration of potential resource objectives for group 11 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—The following issues were identified from our analysis of source habitat trends and from the findings of current research on group 11 species:

1. Decline in late-seral subalpine and montane forests. Cover types with basin-wide decline are western larch and whitebark pine. Declines of Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir are most notable in northern portions of the basin.

2. Potential decline in key components of the shifting food and nesting resource, which is characterized by large areas of conifer trees infected with bark beetles, disease, or heart rot, or in the early stages of decay.

Potential strategies—The following strategies could be used to maintain habitat in the southern and western portions of the basin and to reverse broad-scale declines in the northern and eastern regions:

1. (To address issue no. 1) Basin-wide, maintain remaining old forests of western larch and whitebark pine, and actively manage to promote their long-term sustainability.

2. (To address issue no. 1) In the Northern Glaciated Mountains, Upper Clark Fork, and Snake Headwaters ERUs, accelerate development of old-forest conditions in montane and subalpine forests within areas currently dominated by mid-seral stages.

3. (To address issue no. 2) Throughout the ranges of the species, manage watersheds to maintain foraging and nesting habitat, with the location of that habitat shifting through time. For three-toed woodpeckers, maintain stands that have experienced beetle outbreaks and stand-replacing burns.
Practices that support strategies—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategies no. 1 and no. 2) Use under-story thinning and prescribed burns, or both, to enhance development and sustainability of western larch and whitebark pine old forests.

2. (In support of strategy no. 3) Maintain some large (>214 ha [528 acres]) (Goggans and others 1988) forest stands with bark beetle outbreaks for at least 5 yr, until beetle occupancy diminishes.

3. (In support of strategy no. 3) Where suitable nesting and foraging trees are underrepresented, retain mature and old trees susceptible to bark beetle infestations, disease, and heart rot, or in the early stages of decay.

4. (In support of strategy no. 3) Allow wildfires to burn in some forests with high fire risk to produce stand-replacing conditions, and avoid postfire salvage logging in portions of large burned forests to maintain contiguous burned stands of at least 214 ha (528 acres) (Goggans and others 1988) for about 5 yr postfire.

Group 12—Woodland Caribou

Results

Species ranges and source habitats—Group 12 consists of the woodland caribou, a year-round resident of the basin. Woodland caribou have never been widely distributed in the basin (fig. 36). They are currently restricted to an area within the Northern Glaciated Mountains that includes parts of northeastern Washington, northern Idaho, and northwestern Montana. Evidence of their continued persistence in Montana is scant (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1994). The suspected historical range of the woodland caribou (ICBEMP 1996i) included parts of five ERUs: Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, Central Idaho Mountains, and small portions of the Columbia Plateau and Upper Clark Fork (fig. 36). Woodland caribou were federally listed as endangered in 1984.

Source habitats for woodland caribou are late-seral subalpine and montane forests (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). In total, five cover type-structural stage combinations provide source habitats for the woodland caribou. These are western redcedar/western hemlock old-forest single- and multi-storied stands; grand fir-white fir old-forest single- and multi-storied stands; and Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir old-forest multi-storied stands (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1).

Broad-scale change in source habitats—This analysis of source habitats was based on the historical caribou range. Source habitats were projected to occur in five ERUs: the Columbia Plateau, the Northern Glaciated Mountains, the Lower Clark Fork, the Upper Clark Fork, and the Central Idaho Mountains (fig. 37). Source habitats in the Upper Clark Fork and Columbia Plateau were scarce (fig. 37).

Basin-wide, the trend in source habitats for caribou (historical to current periods) was mixed with 53 percent of watersheds projected with moderately or strongly negative trends and 41 percent with moderately or strongly positive trends (fig. 38). The three ERUs that supported significant caribou habitat each displayed a different trend. Trend in the Northern Glaciated Mountains was predominantly negative with a moderately or strongly negative trend projected for 65 percent of watersheds (fig. 38). For the Lower Clark Fork, a strongly positive trend was projected for 50 percent of watersheds and a strongly negative trend for 38 percent (fig. 38). Finally, a mixed trend was projected for the Central Idaho Mountains with watersheds split almost evenly among those showing a moderately or strongly negative trend (58 percent) and those showing a moderately or strongly positive trend (52 percent) (fig. 38).

Interpreting Results

Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats—The predominantly negative trend for source habitat in the Northern Glaciated Mountains resulted largely from a strong decline in the old-forest multi-story stage of Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). In the Lower Clark Fork ERU, the decrease in Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir old forest was offset by increases in western redcedar-western hemlock and grand fir-white fir old forests (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). In the Central Idaho Mountains, western redcedar-western hemlock, grand fir-white fir, and
Figure 36—Ranges of species in group 12 within the basin (from Marcot and others, in prep.). For species whose ranges shifted significantly from historical conditions, separate maps are shown for historical and current ranges; otherwise, the current range map also denotes the historical range.
Figure 37—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 12 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 38—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 12, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of >60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by n.
Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir old forests all increased (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4), apparently masking geographic variation and resulting in the mixed trend of watersheds increasing and decreasing (fig. 38).

Other factors affecting the group—Analyses by Zager and others (1995) indicated that adult mortality most limits population growth in the Selkirk population, and that at least 30 percent of this mortality is predator related. They suggested that high mortality rates may be associated with an increasing population of mountain lions, that in turn responded to expanding moose and white-tailed deer populations.

Woodland caribou populations are also subject to high rates of neonatal mortality, often approaching 50 percent. Calves typically make up 30 percent of the population at birth, but by recruitment age (1 yr) they typically make up <20 percent of the population (Scott and Servheen 1985). 3

Both roads and human disturbance have been documented as causes of direct mortality for woodland caribou. Fatal collisions with automobiles occur on open roads in woodland caribou habitat (Scott and Servheen 1985). A high percentage of the annual mortality in the 1980s was attributed to illegal harvest by hunters and poachers (Scott and Servheen 1985). Caribou mortality due to illegal shootings has decreased since the species was federally listed as endangered in 1984, but illegal shooting has not been eliminated. Road densities and the potential for human disturbance have both increased from historical to current periods. In woodland caribou range, current average road densities are estimated to be moderate to high (Hann and others 1997).

High levels of disturbance by snowmobiles can cause caribou to abandon portions of their range, although low levels of snowmobile use are believed to be compatible with caribou occupancy of an area (Simpson 1987).

Population status and trends—Historically, caribou were distributed throughout the Northeastern, North-Central, and Northwestern United States. Their range within the basin included northwestern Montana and Idaho south to the Salmon River (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1994). By the 1960s, their range in the United States was restricted to the Selkirk Mountains of northeastern Washington and northern Idaho (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1994). The reduction in the range of the caribou was probably due to a combination of habitat fragmentation (resulting from both fires and timber harvest) and excessive mortality from overharvest and vehicle collisions.

In the 1950s, the Selkirk population of caribou in northeastern Washington, northern Idaho, and southeastern British Columbia was estimated at about 100 animals (Evans 1960, Flinn 1956). By the early 1980s, this population had declined to 25 to 30 animals whose distribution centered around Stagleap Provincial Park, British Columbia (Scott and Servheen 1985). The population in Idaho was augmented with animals from British Columbia three times between 1987 and 1990. The result was the establishment of a herd in the Idaho portion of the Selkirk Mountains. Populations continue to decline, however (see footnote 3; Zager and others 1995). Additional augmentation efforts occurred in the Washington portion of the Selkirks in 1996 and 1997.

Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integration of potential resource objectives for group 12 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—The primary issues for woodland caribou are reported in the Selkirk Mountain Woodland Caribou Recovery Plan (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1994).

1. Reductions in source habitat in key portions of caribou range.
2. Illegal shooting, including accidental shooting by deer and elk hunters.
3. Predation by mountain lions, bears, wolves, and coyotes.
4. Mortality from vehicle collisions.

3 Personal communication. 1997. Wayne Wakkinen, regional wildlife biologist, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, HCR 85, Box 323-J, Bonners Ferry, ID 83805.
5. Displacement resulting from other human disturbance (for example, snowmobiles [Simpson 1987]).

**Potential strategies**—The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has established the following strategies that would provide recovery benefits for woodland caribou:

1. (To address all issues) Maintain the two existing caribou herds in the Selkirk ecosystem, and establish a third herd in the western portion of the Selkirk Mountains in eastern Washington.

2. (To address issue no. 1) Provide for at least 179 415 ha (443,000 acres) of suitable and potential caribou habitat in the Selkirk Mountains to support a self-sustaining population.

**Practices that support strategies**—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above (taken from the Selkirk Mountain Woodland Caribou Recovery Plan [USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1994]):

1. (In support of strategy no. 1) Reduce the impacts of poaching and hunting through outreach programs, restriction of access, and more effective law enforcement.

2. (In support of strategy no. 1) Reduce impacts of caribou-vehicle collisions by identifying areas where collisions are most likely and taking corrective actions (for example, reducing vehicle speeds, rerouting or closing roads, or increasing driver awareness.).

3. (In support of strategy no. 1) Identify most important additional sources of mortality by following radio-collared animals. Reduce other causes to the extent possible, recognizing that some mortality is unavoidable (for example, predation by other listed species).

4. (In support of strategy no. 1) Reduce impacts because of genetic and demographic influences by continuing augmentation and monitoring the success of augmentation efforts (but see Zager and others [1995] for cautions concerning the prognosis for augmentation efforts).

5. (In support of strategy no. 2) Maintain existing late-seral montane and subalpine forests within the areas designated to support caribou herds. Accelerate the development of old-forest conditions in currently mid-seral stands within these areas.

6. (In support of strategy no. 1) Evaluate the effects of roads, motorized vehicles, and recreational activities on caribou. Where such uses are not compatible with recovery (for example, where intensive snowmobile use is displacing caribou) implement standards (such as access timing or area closures) to address the issues.

**Group 13—Northern Flying Squirrel**

**Results**

**Species ranges, source habitats, and special habitat features**—This group consists of the northern flying squirrel, which is a year-round resident of the basin. Flying squirrels occur throughout forested portions of the basin (fig. 39). Source habitats for this species include old-forest and unmanaged young-forest stages of subalpine, montane, lower montane, and riparian woodland cover types (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). The understory reinitiation stage of most of these types also is shown as source habitat (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1; ICBEMPc). This stage is characterized by varying levels of canopy closure, and may contain large trees and other structures (vol. 1, table 4; Hann and others 1997) characteristic of northern flying squirrel habitat (Carey 1995). Because the understory reinitiation stage is highly variable (Hann and others 1997), however, its suitability as source habitat for flying squirrels is also variable.

Two special habitat features have been identified for northern flying squirrels (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2). Flying squirrels nest in cavities that result from either damage to trees or excavation by woodpeckers (Carey 1995). Thus, snags are a special habitat feature, although squirrels also use cavities in live trees and external stick nests (Carey 1995, Waters and Zabel 1995). In a study in western Oregon, Carey (1991) found that snags containing nests average 89 cm (35 in) d.b.h. Down woody material is also an important
feature of flying squirrel habitat (Carey 1991), presumably because of its role in supporting lichens and fungi that are the principle components of the diet of squirrels.

**Broad-scale changes in source habitats—**
Historically, source habitats likely occurred throughout the forested portions of the basin (fig. 40A). Changes from historical have resulted in a reduction in the concentration of habitat across much of the range of the squirrel, with areas of increased habitat in the northeastern, central, and southwestern portions of the basin (figs. 40B, C). Overall, habitat has declined moderately or strongly in nearly 60 percent of watersheds in the basin and increased moderately or strongly in 27 percent of watersheds (fig. 41).

In eight ERUs, source habitat declined moderately or strongly in more than 50 percent of watersheds. These ERUs are the Northern Cascades, Southern Cascades, Columbia Plateau, Blue Mountains, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Upper Clark Fork, Lower Clark Fork, and Snake Headwaters. Source habitat increased moderately or strongly in more than 50 percent of watersheds in the Upper Klamath and had mixed trends in the Central Idaho Mountains. Only relatively small amounts of habitat are present in the remaining three ERUs.

**Interpreting Results**

**Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats—**Ecologically significant decreases were projected (Hann and others 1997) for late-seral lower montane forests in seven of the eight ERUs for which source habitat declined in more than 50 percent of watersheds. The exception was the Snake Headwaters where significant declines were projected in late-seral montane and subalpine forests but not in late-seral lower montane forests. In addition to the declines in late-seral lower montane forests, there were declines in late-seral montane and late-seral subalpine forests in the Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork.
Figure 40—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 13 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 41—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 13, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by n.
(Hann and others 1997). Declines in late-seral subalpine forests also contributed to the decreases in source habitat in the Northern Cascades and Blue Mountains.

Unmanaged young forest and understory reinitiation stages declined throughout the basin, including substantial losses in unmanaged young forest in the Northern Cascades and Upper Snake for cover types used as source habitat by northern flying squirrels (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). An exception to this general pattern of decreases was increases in understory reinitiation in the Northern Glaciated Mountains and Lower Clark Fork. These increases likely account for the areas of increasing source habitat concentration that were projected (fig. 40) within these ERUs, which otherwise displayed general declines in source habitat. Because these mid-seral stages, and particularly the understory reinitiation stage, are quite variable, these projected increases merit further evaluation at a finer scale.

In the Upper Klamath, the only ERU for which an increase in source habitat was projected in more than 50 percent of watersheds, there were ecologically significant increases in late-seral lower montane, montane, and subalpine forests (Hann and others 1997).

**Condition of special habitat features**—Densities of large-diameter snags (>53 cm [21 in] d.b.h.) likely declined basin-wide from historical to current levels (Quigley and others 1996, USDA Forest Service 1996).

**Other factors affecting the group**—Forest management practices may have a significant effect on the hypogeous sporocarps of mycorrhizal fungi, a principal food source for flying squirrels. In a study in the Klamath Mountains, hypogeous sporocarps were nearly absent from clearcuts and were strongly associated with coarse woody debris in late seral forests (Clarkson and Mills 1994). The negative association with clearcuts was thought to be due to microclimatic conditions and the effects of postharvest slash burns (Clarkson and Mills 1994). In a study in northeastern California, flying squirrel abundance was associated with the frequency of hypogeous sporocarps (Waters and Zabel 1995), but no correlation was found between sporocarp abundance and either thinning or broadcast burning (Waters and others 1994, cited in Waters and Zabel 1995). This study, however, did not examine sporocarp abundance in relation to clearcuts versus mature forests.

**Population status and trends**—No population trend information is available for northern flying squirrels within the basin.

**Management Implications**

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integration of potential resource objectives for group 13 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

**Issues**—The following issues were identified from the results of our analysis and other empirical research:

1. Widespread loss of old forests and associated structures (snags, logs, and cavities).
2. Reduced availability of remnant large trees and snags in all seral stages (Hann and others 1997).
3. Negative effect of forest management activities on fungus and lichen diversity and abundance (Carey 1991).

**Potential strategies**—The following strategies could be used to reverse broad-scale declines in source habitats and populations:

1. (To address issues nos. 1-3) Maintain existing late-seral forests and encourage the development of appropriate habitat structures (snags, decayed down wood, and abundance of fungi and lichens) in mid-seral forests in all cover types used as source habitats, particularly in the northern half of the basin (Northern Cascades, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork ERUs).

**Practices that support strategies**—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategy no. 1) In the northern basin, give high priority to retention of old forests that have relatively low risk of loss through catastrophic fire. Priority should be given to large blocks having high interior-to-edge ratios and few large openings.
2. (In support of strategy no. 1) Actively recruit snags and logs from green trees to increase the representation of old-forest structures (snags and logs) in mid-seral stands and in old forests where snags and logs are in low density or absent.

3. (In support of strategy no. 1) Manage early- and mid-seral stands for increased vegetative diversity in order to encourage fungus and lichen diversity and abundance (Carey 1991).

**Group 14—Hermit Warbler**

**Results**

**Species ranges and source habitats**—Group 14 consists of the hermit warbler, a migrant that breeds in the basin and winters in high-elevation forests in Mexico and Central America. Most of the range of the hermit warbler occurs outside the basin along the west coast of British Columbia, Washington, Oregon, and California, overlapping the basin only along the crest of the Cascade Range (fig. 42) primarily in three ERUs: the Northern Cascades, Southern Cascades, and Upper Klamath.

Habitat for hermit warblers is characterized by medium to large conifers (>31 cm [12.2 in] d.b.h.) (Morrison 1982). Source habitats within the basin include the old-forest and young-forest structural stages of interior Douglas-fir, red fir, grand fir-white fir, and Sierra Nevada mixed conifer (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Both managed and unmanaged young forest support source habitat.

**Broad-scale changes in source habitats**—Source habitats for hermit warblers occur along the crest of the Cascade Range (fig. 43). Within this area, source habitat was projected to have increased moderately or strongly in over 75 percent of watersheds (fig. 44). Habitat decreased moderately or strongly in only 17 percent of watersheds. Source habitat increased moderately or strongly in 62 percent of watersheds in the Northern Cascades, in 90 percent of watersheds in the Southern Cascades, and in 100 percent of watersheds in the Upper Klamath (fig. 44).
Figure 43—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 14 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 44—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 14, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by n.
Interpreting Results

Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats—In the Northern Cascades, the increase in source habitat was due to increases in managed young-forest stages of interior Douglas-fir and grand fir-white fir (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). In the Southern Cascades, increasing source habitat was associated with increases in interior Douglas-fir and grand fir-white fir old forests and interior Douglas-fir managed young forest (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). In the Upper Klamath, increases were driven by increasing old-forest stages of interior Douglas-fir and grand fir-white fir (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4).

Other factors affecting the group—Hermit warblers forage along conifer branches, and sometimes deciduous trees and shrubs, for beetles, caterpillars, small flying insects, and spiders (Terres 1991). Thus, measures taken to control insects may impact hermit warblers.

The hermit warbler winters in high-elevation forests in Mexico and Nicaragua and sparingly into Costa Rica (Sharp 1992). Impacts to wintering habitats may negatively affect the species.

Population status and trends—There are insufficient data in the BBS information to be able to predict a population trend for the hermit warbler across the basin (Saab and Rich 1997). The BBS data analyzed within other geographic boundaries (Sauer and others 1996), however, showed an increasing trend in hermit warbler populations in eastern Oregon and Washington (7.6 percent per year, \( n = 7, P < 0.01, 1966 \) to 1979).

Management Implications

No significant issues were identified for hermit warblers or their habitat.

Group 15—Pygmy Shrew and Wolverine

Results

Species ranges, source habitats, and special habitat features—This group consists of the pygmy shrew and wolverine, which are year-round residents of the basin. Wolverines occur in parts of all ERUs in the basin, although they are absent from the middle portion of the Columbia Plateau, and the south-central portion of the basin (fig. 45). The range of the pygmy shrew is restricted to the northeastern portion of the basin, primarily within the Northern Glaciated Mountains and Lower Clark Fork ERUs (fig. 45).

Both species should be considered generalists. Source habitats for pygmy shrews include virtually all structural stages of all subalpine and montane forests with the exception of Sierra Nevada mixed conifer (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). All stages of the shrub-herb-tree regeneration type also serve as source habitat for pygmy shrews. Source habitats for wolverines include alpine tundra and all subalpine and montane forests (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Within the forest types, all structural stages except the closed canopy stem exclusion stage provide source habitat.

Wolverines are predominantly scavengers, especially in winter when their diets consist primarily of ungulate carcasses (Banci 1994). In summer, they use a wider variety of foods including small mammals, birds, carrion, and berries (Weaver and others 1996). Copeland (1996) found that carrion-related food supplied 46 percent of wolverine diets in Idaho during both summer and winter. Banci (1994) suggested that diversity of habitats and foods is important to wolverines.

Several special habitat features have been identified for wolverines (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2). Natal dens in Idaho were primarily located in subalpine cirque basins in isolated talus surrounded by trees (Copeland 1996). There is also evidence that wolverines use down logs and hollow trees for denning (Copeland 1996; Pulliainen 1968, as cited in Banci 1994), and cavities in live trees also may be used (Ognev 1935, cited in Banci 1994; Pulliainen 1968). Both talus and areas associated with large, fallen trees were used as maternal den sites in Idaho (Copeland 1996).

No special habitat features were identified for the pygmy shrew.

Broad-scale changes in source habitats—Historically, source habitats likely occurred throughout the forested portions of the basin, with some of the greatest concentrations in the northeast (fig. 46A).
Figure 45—Ranges of species in group 15 within the basin (from Marcot and others, in prep.). For species whose ranges shifted significantly from historical conditions, separate maps are shown for historical and current ranges; otherwise, the current range map also denotes the historical range.
Figure 46—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 15 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 47—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 15, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by n.
From historical to current times, source habitat has increased in the central and western portions of the basin and undergone minor decreases in the north (fig. 46B).

Basin-wide, source habitat was projected to have increased moderately or strongly in 56 percent of watersheds and to have decreased moderately or strongly in 22 percent (fig. 47). Within the nine ERUs that support significant amounts of source habitat (fig. 47), five (Northern Cascades, Southern Cascades, Columbia Plateau, Blue Mountains, and Central Idaho Mountains) have undergone moderate or strong increases in more than 50 percent of watersheds, one (Upper Clark Fork) has undergone decreases in 50 percent or more of watersheds, and three (Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Snake Headwaters) have had mixed trends.

**Interpreting Results**

**Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats**—Causes for source habitat increases and decreases differed across ERUs (Hann and others 1997). Community types that most influenced habitat increases were early seral montane in the Northern Cascades, late-seral subalpine in the Southern Cascades, mid- and late-seral montane in the Columbia Plateau, mid- and late-seral montane in the Blue Mountains, and early-seral subalpine and late-seral montane in the Central Idaho Mountains. In the Upper Clark Fork, community types that contributed most to the decline in habitat were early- and late-seral montane.

**Condition of special habitat features**—Densities of large-diameter snags (>53 cm [21 in] d.b.h.) and of large, remnant trees likely declined basin-wide from historical to current levels (Hann and others 1997, Hessburg and others 1999, Quigley and others 1996). Trends in snag abundance ultimately affect the availability of large down logs and cavities, whereas the decrease in large, remnant trees would likely translate to a decrease in large, hollow trees. Talus likely exists currently where it existed historically.

**Other factors affecting the group**—The clearcut method of timber harvest can negatively affect wolverines. Snow-tracking and radio telemetry in Montana indicated that wolverines avoided recent clearcuts and burns (Hornocker and Hash 1981).

Copeland (1996), however, found that wolverines in Idaho commonly crossed natural openings, burned areas, meadows, or open mountain tops.

Populations of wolverines can be impacted by fur harvesting if trapping is not carefully regulated (Banci 1994). Within the basin, trapping is allowed only in Montana, and most of the harvest is believed to be incidental in traps set for other carnivores (Banci 1994).

Copeland (1996) found that human disturbance near natal denning habitat resulted in immediate den abandonment but not kit abandonment. Disturbances that could affect wolverine are heli-skiing, snowmobiles, backcountry skiing, logging, hunting, and summer recreation (Copeland 1996, Hornocker and Hash 1981, ICBEMP1996f). Wolverine densities in Montana, however, did not differ between the wilderness and nonwilderness portions of one study area, nor was their behavior or habitat use different, based on snow tracking and radio telemetry (Hornocker and Hash 1981). In addition, Hornocker and Hash (1981) concluded that movements of wolverines in Montana were not affected by highways.

Weaver and others (1996) argued that wolverines are less resilient than other large carnivores due to their low lifetime reproductive capability, susceptibility to natural fluctuations in scavenging opportunities, and vulnerability to trapping. They suggested that wolverines, along with grizzly bears, have a greater requirement for large, contiguous reserves than do other large carnivores such as gray wolves and mountain lions.

No information is available on other factors that might affect the pygmy shrew.

**Population status and trends**—Hash (1987) described a contraction in the North American range of the wolverine beginning around 1840 with the onset of extensive exploration, fur trade, and settlement. State records suggest very low wolverine numbers in Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington from the 1920s through 1950s, with increases in wolverine sighting since the 1960s (Banci 1994). The increases in Montana (Newby and McDonald 1964, Newby and Wright 1955) and in Washington (Johnson 1977) may have resulted from dispersal from Canada.

Throughout its range, the pygmy shrew is considered rare (Feldhamer and others 1993), and basin-wide trends in pygmy shrew populations are unknown.
Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integration of potential resource objectives for group 15 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—The following issues were identified from the results of our analysis and other empirical research:

1. Loss of montane and subalpine old-forests and associated structures (snags, logs, and cavities), particularly in the northern portion of the basin.
2. Low population numbers.
3. Increased negative effects from humans, resulting from higher road densities, increased technological advances in vehicular capabilities, and interest in winter recreation.

Potential strategies—The following strategies could be used to reverse broad-scale declines in source habitats and populations:

1. (To address issue no. 1) Increase the representation of late-seral stage forests in all cover types used as source habitats, particularly in the northern half of the basin (Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork ERUs).
2. (To address issues no. 2 and no. 3) Identify refugia for long-term management of wolverine (Banci 1994).
3. (To address issues no. 2 and no. 3) Provide adequate links among existing wolverine populations. These dispersal corridors likely do not require the same habitat attributes needed to support self-sustaining populations (Banci 1994).
4. (To address issue no. 3) Reduce human disturbances, particularly in areas with known or high potential for wolverine natal den sites (subalpine talus cirques).

Practices that support strategies—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategy no. 1) In the northern basin, retain existing old forests and identify mid-successional forests where attainment of old-forest conditions can be accelerated.
2. (In support of strategy no. 1) Actively recruit snags and logs from green trees to increase the representation of old-forest structures (snags and logs) in mid-seral stands and in old forests where snags and logs are uncommon or absent.
3. (In support of strategy no. 1) Retain slash piles and decks of cull logs to substitute for down logs over the short term.
4. (In support of strategy no. 2) Maintain current wilderness areas and other congressionally designated reserves as refugia for wolverine, and reduce human disturbances near den sites in these areas.
5. (In support of strategy no. 2) Identify existing areas with the following desired conditions, or manage selected areas to create the following desired conditions for species strongholds: large, contiguous blocks of forest cover with abundant snags and large logs and low road densities with connectivity to subalpine cirque habitats required for denning, security, and summer foraging habitat.
6. (In support of strategy no. 3) Identify isolated populations and unoccupied habitats and use interagency planning to develop broad-scale links over the long term.
7. (In support of strategy no. 4) Minimize new construction of secondary roads and close unneeded roads after timber harvests.

No explicit recommendations are available in the literature or are any available from our results for the pygmy shrew.

Group 16—Lynx

Results

Species ranges, source habitats, and special habitat features—The lynx, a year-round resident of the basin, is the only member of group 16. The range of the lynx includes the northern, eastern, and central portions of the basin (fig. 48). There are limited
records of lynx occurring in the Southern Cascades ERU (McKelvey and others 1999), but these records were not included in the range map delineated by Marcot and others (in prep.). In March 2000, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service determined the lynx to be a threatened species pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (U.S. Government 2000a).

Primary habitat for lynx is found in subalpine and montane forests that are cold or moist forest types (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1; McKelvey and others 1999). Within the montane forest community, source habitats are provided by all vegetation types except Pacific silver fir–mountain hemlock, red fir, and Sierra Nevada mixed conifer. Within the subalpine forest community, only Engelmann spruce–subalpine fir provides source habitat. Lynx habitat includes various structural stages (Koehler and Aubry 1994, Ruggiero and others 1999).

Lynx forage primarily in early-seral forests and in some mid-seral forests that support high numbers of prey; lynx also use late-seral forests for denning and rearing young as well as for hunting alternative sources of prey (Ruggiero and others 1999). Consequently, source habitats for lynx are provided by most of the coniferous forest structural stages with the exception of old-forest single-storied stands (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Riparian woodlands and shrublands are also source habitats.

Hollow down logs are a special habitat feature for lynx (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2); logs are used both as den sites and resting places (ICBEMP 1996e, Koehler 1990).

**Broad-scale changes in source habitats**—Basin-wide, amounts of source habitats for lynx increased moderately or strongly in 47 percent of watersheds and decreased in 23 percent from historical to current...
Figure 49—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 16 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 50—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 16, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of >20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by $n$. 
periods (figs. 49 and 50). Habitat increased in more than 50 percent of the watersheds in two ERUs, the Blue Mountains and the Northern Glaciated Mountains (fig. 50). Trends were mixed in the remaining ERUs that contain significant habitat: Northern Cascades, Upper Clark Fork, Lower Clark Fork, Snake Headwaters, and Central Idaho Mountains (fig. 50).

**Interpreting Results**

**Composition and structure associated with changes in source habitats**—A strong increase in mid-seral montane forests, along with increases in early- and mid-seral subalpine forests (Hann and others 1997), accounted for the increasing source habitat trend in the Northern Glaciated Mountains. Increases in mid- and late-seral montane forests and early- and mid-seral subalpine forests (Hann and others 1997) contributed to the overall increase in source habitats in the Blue Mountains. Mid-seral montane and subalpine forests also increased in the Lower Clark Fork, Upper Clark Fork, and Snake Headwaters ERUs; however, these increases were offset by decreases in early-seral montane forests and late-seral montane and subalpine forests (Hann and others 1997). In the Northern Cascades, increases in early-seral montane and subalpine forests were offset by decreases in mid- and late-seral subalpine forests (Hann and others 1997). There were increases in early- and late-seral montane and subalpine forests in the Central Idaho Mountains (Hann and others 1997), but these increases were not widespread enough to result in an overall moderate or strong ERU trend.

**Condition of special habitat features**—Hann and others (1997) reported a decrease in abundance and occurrence of large down logs in areas of traditional forest management. Large down logs are used by lynx for denning and rearing young (Ruggiero and others 1999).

**Other factors affecting the group**—Trapping can be a significant source of mortality for lynx (Bailey and others 1986, Carbyn and Patriquin 1983, Mech 1980, Nellis and others 1972, Parker and others 1983, Ward and Krebs 1985). Trappers are capable of removing from 60 to 80 percent of the individuals in a given lynx population (Bailey and others 1986, Parker and others 1983). Incidental takes of lynx during bobcat and coyote trapping seasons may be cause for concern, especially with low-density lynx populations. Other forms of human disturbance also affect lynx. According to Koehler and Brittell (1990), minimal human disturbance is important to denning site selection. Winter recreation may have a significant effect on lynx populations. The packing effect of snowmobile trails may open areas of deep snow to foraging from other predators such as bobcats and lynx (Kohler and Aubry 1994, Ruggiero and others 1999). In the north Cascades, snowmobiling and other winter recreation have increased in the past decade, with suspected negative effects on lynx. The increase in interactions between human and lynx, primarily because of increased use of off-highway vehicles (including snowmobiles), may result in increased lynx mortality from intentional and unintentional shooting and collisions with vehicles (Koehler and Brittell 1990). Highways could also pose barriers to lynx movement or increase mortality from vehicle collisions (Ruediger 1996, Terra-Berns and others 1997).

Lynx populations are closely tied to snowshoe hare population trends, especially north of the basin (Butts 1992, Murray and Boutin 1991, Parker and others 1983, Weaver 1993). Lynx populations in the basin, however, may not be as cyclic as those at more northern latitudes (Brittell and others 1989, Koehler 1990). Within the basin, several other predators (bobcat, red fox, and some hawk and owl species) compete with lynx for snowshoe hare as prey, unlike areas to the north; many of these competing predators possibly respond more positively to human-induced habitat alterations (Roloff 1995). This increased competition for prey may increase the vulnerability of lynx (Witmer and others 1998) as well as limit the size of lynx populations (Boutin and others 1986, Keith and others 1984).

Forest management practices have varying effects on both lynx and lynx prey habitat (Ruggiero and others 1999). Lynx do not hunt in large, open areas with little or no cover (Koehler 1990, Koehler and Brittell 1990), making large clearcut blocks potential barriers to movement (Koehler and Aubry 1994). Early-seral habitats created by fire or logging, however, are essential to maintain foraging areas for lynx prey, principally snowshoe hare (Koehler and Aubry 1994, Koehler and Brittell 1990). Koehler and Aubry (1994) proposed that frequent, small patches of habitat

---

alteration that mimic natural disturbance patterns would be beneficial. Post-clearcut areas may not become suitable for snowshoe hare habitat for more than 10 years and may not become optimal hare habitat for another 20 years (Koehler and Aubry 1994). Relatively small patches of old forest (1 ha [2.5 acres]) are needed for denning, though these areas must be near and connected to good foraging habitat (Koehler and Brittell 1990). Travel corridors generally have a closed-canopy cover >2 m high (6.5 ft.) (Brittell and others 1989).

Population status and trends—Empirical data for distribution of lynx within the basin are scarce, and data on abundance of lynx populations are not available. McKelvey and others (1999) recently summarized all known lynx locations in the United States, which provides a framework for designing and conducting future surveys and demographic studies of lynx populations.

Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integrating potential resource objectives for group 16 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—The following issues for lynx were taken from the literature.

1. The lack of empirical information on population ecology, foraging ecology, den site characteristics, habitat relations at the landscape scale, and distribution and status in the basin (Ruggiero and others 1999).

2. Altered mosaic of source habitats because of fire suppression and logging (Hann and others 1997).


4. The peninsular and disjunct distribution of suitable lynx habitat in the western mountains (Koehler and Aubry 1994), and the associated potential for population isolation or limited metapopulation structure to cause local or regional extirpations (Ruggiero and others 1999).

Potential strategies—

1. (To address issue no. 1) Develop an interagency research, inventory, and monitoring effort aimed at gathering information on population ecology, foraging ecology, den site characteristics, habitat relations at the landscape scale, and distribution and status in the basin.

2. (To address issue no. 2) Restore fire as an ecological process or use other forest management practices in montane and upper montane community types to provide for a suitable mosaic of early-seral habitat rich in shrubs and well connected to late-seral habitat with abundant large down logs.

3. (To address issue no. 3) Design silvicultural treatments at a landscape scale with the needs of snowshoe hare and other lynx prey as one consideration.

4. (To address issue no. 3) Provide areas of high-quality lynx habitat that are protected from human disturbance (Koehler and Aubry 1994).

5. (To address issue no. 4) Develop a strategy to allow for interactions among lynx populations, including the provision of travel corridors (Koehler 1990) and broader landscape connectivity.

6. (To address issue no. 4) Develop a strategy to allow for population reintroductions as appropriate.

Practices that support strategies—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategies no. 2 and no. 3) Management of stand dynamics for lynx and snowshoe hares focuses on the creation of early and late old-forest structural stages consistent with historical variability. In designing forest landscapes, give management consideration to habitats for alternate prey species such as red squirrel, voles, and mice in addition to denning habitat for lynx. Down wood is an important denning habitat component. When thinning stands to meet timber management objectives, stands should either be thinned early before they are recolonized by snowshoe hares or thinned when they are older (for example, 30 to 40 yr) and are little used by hares.
2. (In support of strategy no. 4) In areas of known or suspected lynx populations, close roads and areas to all vehicles as needed to minimize human disturbance, limit potential increase in competing predators, and provide for landscape connectivity among and within populations. Improve highway passage by using fencing and overpasses and underpasses.

3. (In support of strategies no. 5 and no. 6) Identify areas that currently support high-quality lynx habitat, have low road densities, and are sites of recent lynx observation. Identify such sites as species strongholds, and use them as the backbone of a metapopulation strategy (see vol. 1).

**Group 17—Blue Grouse (Summer) and Mountain Quail (Summer)**

**Results**

**Species ranges, source habitats, and special habitat features**—Group 17 consists of summer habitats for both blue grouse and mountain quail. The range of the blue grouse includes the western, northern, central, and eastern portions of the basin (fig. 51). The range of the mountain quail includes southern Washington, Oregon, and western Idaho (fig. 51; Ehrlich and others 1988). Blue grouse are ground nesters that forage primarily on seeds, berries, and insects; the young feed heavily on insects (Ehrlich and others 1988). Mountain quail are also ground nesters and feed primarily on bulbs, greens, and insects (Ehrlich and others 1988).

Source habitats for group 17 include all structural stages except stem exclusion of interior Douglas-fir, Sierra Nevada mixed conifer, and Pacific and interior ponderosa pine (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). In addition, blue grouse source habitats also include western larch, aspen, mixed-conifer woodlands, antelope bitterbrush-bluebunch wheatgrass, and wheatgrass bunchgrass. Chokecherry-serviceberry-rose is also source habitat for both species.

A special habitat feature for the mountain quail is riparian shrub (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2). Mountain quail within the basin primarily are found within 100 to 200 m (328 to 656 ft) of a water source (Brennan 1989). The blue grouse (summer) is considered a contrast species as it is typically found at the interface of forest and open areas (Zwickel 1992; vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2).

**Broad-scale changes in source habitats**—Source habitats for blue grouse (summer) and mountain quail (summer) occur primarily in the forested ERUs across the basin (fig. 52A and 52B). The overall trend in source habitats since historical times has been neutral (fig. 53), with increasing trends occurring primarily in the western and southeastern part of the basin, and more decreasing trends occurring in the northeast part of the basin. The ERUs with increasing trends are the Southern Cascades, Upper Klamath, Northern Great Basin, Upper Snake, and Snake Headwaters. The ERUs with decreasing trends are the Lower Clark Fork, Upper Clark Fork, and Central Idaho Mountains. The remaining ERUs are overall neutral (Northern Cascades, Columbia Plateau, Blue Mountains, Northern Glaciated Mountains, and Owyhee Uplands).

**Interpreting Results**

**Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats**—Increases in source habitats in the Northern Cascades are primarily because of increases in managed young forests of interior Douglas-fir and interior ponderosa pine, whereas a similar decline occurred in old-forest ponderosa pine (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). Increases in source habitats in the Southern Cascades, Upper Klamath, and Blue Mountains, and southern portions of the Columbia Plateau are due primarily to increases in old forest. Decreases in source habitats in much of the northeastern part of the basin are due to declines in both late- and early-seral community types.

The primary changes in source habitats in the Upper Snake were an increase in wheatgrass bunchgrass (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). Hann and others (1997), however, suspect that in some areas that show increases in upland herblands (including wheatgrass bunchgrass), these areas may in fact be areas of early-seral forests attributable to relatively recent timber harvest or large-scale wildfires, and were misclassified as upland herbland. In such a case, recent timber harvest or wildfire may have increased the quantity and quality of source habitat because of potential increases in
Figure 51—Ranges of species in group 17 within the basin (from Marcot and others, in prep.). For species whose ranges shifted significantly from historical conditions, separate maps are shown for historical and current ranges; otherwise, the current range map also denotes the historical range.
Figure 52—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 17 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 53—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 17, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by n.
shrubs. Increases in wheatgrass bunchgrass, however, also may be attributable to increases in exotic wheatgrasses such as crested wheatgrass, which does not provide source habitat for blue grouse. The increase in source habitat in the Snake Headwaters is primarily due to an increase in both early- and mid-seral interior Douglas-fir (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4).

Condition of special habitat features—Basin-wide analysis of riparian vegetation found significant changes, including widespread declines in riparian shrublands (Quigley and others 1996). Because of the scale of our analysis and the fine-scale nature of riparian shrubland habitats, likely the results of our analysis do not reveal the true loss in this important habitat component for mountain quail. Water impoundments, grazing, residential developments, and agricultural activities can alter the extent, composition, and structure of mountain quail habitat (Brennan 1990, Murray 1938, Vogel and Reese 1995). Remaining habitat in the basin is fragmented, and populations exist often in islands of habitat connected by narrow corridors of vegetation (Vogel and Reese 1995).

Because the blue grouse (summer) is a forest-open areas contrast species, the scale of this analysis does not allow determination of change in the juxtaposition of these contrasting habitats. Thus, this special habitat feature is not accounted for in the results presented above, and a finer scale analysis is needed to fully evaluate the status of their source habitats. A loss of interspersion of early- and late-seral stages of forest partly because of altered fire regimes was identified by Lehmkuhl and others (1997) as a reason for a declining trend since the historical period of both habitat and populations of the blue grouse.

Other factors affecting the species—Some mountain quail populations migrate to lower elevations to winter (Brennan 1990, Ehrlich and others 1988, Leopold and others 1981). Winter habitat availability may be more limited than summer habitat because of severe winter weather in some mountainous areas (Edminster 1954). Low-elevation riparian shrub habitat is especially important during severe winters. Hydroelectric impoundments along the Columbia River and its tributaries have flooded thousands of acres of low-elevation winter habitat for mountain quail (Brennan 1990). One of the last remaining Idaho populations can be found along the Salmon River drainage in an area that experiences mild winters, thought to be one of the important variables for the continued presence of quail in this area (Brennan 1989).

Both blue grouse and mountain quail most often are found in areas with a high abundance of shrubs, which most likely are used for cover as well as forage (Brennan and others 1987, Zwickel 1992). Traditional forest managers commonly replanted harvested areas, thus hastening the rate of succession and shortening the time that a stand remains in the early-seral stage (Hann and others 1997). This practice, coupled with ground-disturbing site preparation before planting, often eliminates the herb, forb, and shrub structures from stands. Management activities such as salvage logging and planting in postfire habitats also may shorten the duration of these early-seral, shrub-dominated sites.

Grazing of domestic livestock may negatively impact blue grouse (Mussehl 1963, Zwickel 1972), as well as mountain quail (Brennan 1990).

The frequency and areal extent of wildfires declined since the early to mid 1900s because of suppression activities (Hann and others 1997). With the increased fuel loads in fire-suppressed areas, however, the trend since 1960 has changed, and the current extent of wildfires is approaching that of the early 1900s. This increase in postfire areas should benefit both blue grouse and mountain quail if these fires result in an increase in shrub vegetation.

Both species are negatively affected by human disturbance, primarily during the nesting/brood-rearing season (ICBEMP 1996h). The human population in the basin is estimated at 3 million, which is a substantial increase from the pre-European settlement period (McCool and others 1997). This change in population increases human encounters, thus having a potentially negative effect on both blue grouse and mountain quail. In particular, the introduction of human residents to an area also introduces domestic cats, an effective predator of mountain quail (Edminster 1954, Jewett and others 1953, McLean 1930.)

There are open hunting seasons for blue grouse throughout the basin, whereas hunting for mountain quail is only allowed in some parts of Oregon.
Population status and trends—Blue grouse still occupy most of their original range, although historical populations may have been stronger in some areas (Zwickel 1992). Although mountain quail populations to the west of the basin seem to be stable, populations in the basin have experienced dramatic declines (Brennan 1990, Robertson 1989, Washington Department of Wildlife 1993a).

Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integrating potential resource objectives for group 17 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—Issues identified for group 17 were based on our analysis of source habitats as well as knowledge of finer scale habitat features for these species:

1. Decline in late- and early-seral source habitats, particularly in the northeastern part of the basin.
2. Changes in vegetation composition and structure of understory shrub habitat.
3. Loss of riparian shrubs.
4. Increased interaction with humans.
5. Isolated and disjunct populations of mountain quail vulnerable to extinction by stochastic events (that is, demographic, environmental, or genetic stochasticity).

Proposed strategies—

1. (To address issue no. 1) Maintain and restore late-seral montane and lower montane forests.
2. (To address issues no. 1 and no. 2) Increase the representation of shrub-dominated early seral forests.
3. (To address issues no. 1 and no. 2) Restore fire as an ecological process in the montane and lower montane community groups.
4. (To address issue no. 3) Maintain and restore riparian shrubland habitats, including protecting existing areas from the encroachment of exotics.
5. (To address issue no. 3) Reduce habitat degradation by livestock grazing in areas currently occupied by mountain quail.
6. (To address issue no. 4) Restrict human access in areas of known nesting use by blue grouse and mountain quail.
7. (To address issue no. 5) Expand the current range of mountain quail within their historical range.

Practices that support strategies—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategy no. 1) Maintain existing old forests until mid-seral forests have developed into old forests at a level that is within the range of historical variability.
2. (In support of strategy no. 2) Leave some postfire areas unaltered to regenerate naturally.
3. (In support of strategy no. 3) Use prescribed fire to enhance growth and regeneration of understory or mountain shrub development. Avoid burning during the nesting season, as fires can cause direct mortality to mountain quail (Clark 1935, McLean 1930, Spaulding 1949).
4. (In support of strategy no. 4) Reduce exotic weed invasions by plantings of native shrub and herbaceous vegetation in riparian shrubland habitats.
5. (In support of strategy no. 5) Remove or explicitly control the timing and intensity of grazing to discourage weed invasions and to minimize losses and allow for restoration of native riparian and mountain shrubs.
6. (In support of strategy no. 6) Reduce road densities and timing of management activities to reduce human interactions with these species, especially
during the nesting and brooding season. In addition or as an alternative to reductions in road density, implement seasonal road closures during nesting and brooding periods.

7. (In support of strategy no. 7) Reintroduce and augment populations of mountain quail after habitat enhancement.

**Group 18—Lazuli Bunting**

**Results**

**Species ranges and source habitats**—Group 18 consists of the Lazuli bunting, a migratory breeder that occurs throughout the basin (fig. 54). Source habitats for Lazuli buntings are grass-forb-shrub edges, burns, early-seral stages of conifer forest, and dense, low vegetation along streams (Sharp 1992). Hutto (1995) found that Lazuli buntings demonstrated a strong positive response to early successional burned forests, resulting from stand-replacing fires that occurred in a broad spectrum of coniferous forest types across western Montana and northern Wyoming. This bunting was also a common nesting species in recently burned ponderosa pine/Douglas-fir forests of western Idaho (Saab and Dudley 1998). The Lazuli bunting is a shrub-nesting insectivore, foraging primarily by gleaning off foliage (Ehrlich and others 1988).

Source habitats analyzed in this report are the stand-initiation stage of the montane, lower montane, riparian woodland terrestrial communities and also chokecherry-serviceberry-rose (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Among landscape and microhabitat features of cottonwood forests in eastern Idaho, the most important predictor of Lazuli bunting occurrence was shrub density and cover (Saab 1999). Other significant predictors of their occurrence included herbaceous ground cover and willow subcanopies, providing foraging and nesting habitat, respectively. Additionally, their relative abundance was significantly reduced in forest patches managed for grazing compared with unmanaged patches (Saab 1996, 1998). In cottonwood forests of
western Montana, the abundance of Lazuli buntings also was reduced in heavily grazed areas, as compared to lightly grazed areas (Mosconi and Hutto 1981).

**Broad-scale changes in source habitats**—Historically source habitats for group 18 were broadly distributed throughout the mountainous regions of the basin, though most watersheds with source habitats contained less than 25 percent area in source habitats (fig. 55A). Currently, source habitats are more patchily distributed and absent from many watersheds that historically contained these habitats (fig. 55B).

The trend in source habitats was negative to strongly negative for nearly 60 percent of the watersheds in the basin (figs. 55C and 56). About 33 percent of the watersheds basin-wide had positive trends in source habitats (fig. 56). Eight ERUs had negative to strongly negative trends, including the Upper Klamath, Northern Great Basin, Columbia Plateau, Blue Mountains, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, Upper Clark Fork, and Upper Snake. Trends were neutral in the Southern Cascades and Owyhee Uplands. Three ERUs, the Northern Cascades, Snake Headwaters, and Central Idaho Mountains, had positive trends.

**Interpreting Results**

**Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats**—For the ERUs with positive trends, increased area of various cover types, especially Douglas-fir, Englemann spruce, lodgepole pine, and aspen, were responsible for the trend (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). For the eight ERUs with negative trends, the loss of early-seral Douglas-fir, lodgepole pine, interior ponderosa pine, and western larch contributed most to the trend. Nearly 100 percent of the western larch stand-initiation stage was eliminated in these ERUs.

In addition, basin-wide declines have occurred in riparian woodlands at the broad scale (Hann and others 1997). Smaller patches of riparian vegetation, especially riparian shrublands, have declined in extent basin-wide because of disruption of hydrologic regimes from dams, water diversions, and road construction. Additionally, grazing and trampling of riparian vegetation by livestock, and increased recreational use along stream courses have reduced riparian habitats (USDA Forest Service 1996). Low-elevation wetlands in Idaho are considered “endangered” based on a 85- to 98-percent decline since European settlement (Noss and others 1995).

**Other factors affecting the group**—Traditional forestry practices commonly tried to accelerate the regeneration process in harvested areas by planting, thus hastening the rate of succession and shortening the time that a stand remained in the early-seral stage (Hann and others 1997). This practice coupled with ground-disturbing site-preparation activities before planting often eliminated the herb, forb, and shrub structure from stands. Planting in postfire habitats also shortens the duration of the stand-initiation stage. Salvage logging in postfire habitats may reduce the availability of tall structures used for singing perches. Hutto (1995) found that the relative abundance of many bird species, including the Lazuli bunting, differed between recently burned and recently harvested forests. Composition of trees, snags, and shrubs subsequent to a burn can differ depending on fire intensity and postfire timber harvest.

According to Hann and others (1997), the frequency and areal extent of wildfires declined since the early to mid 1900s because of suppression activities. With the increased fuel loads in fire-suppressed areas, however, the trend since 1960 has changed, and the current extent of wildfires is approaching the early 1900s. This increase in postfire areas should benefit Lazuli buntings if these fires result in an increase in shrub vegetation.

Lazuli buntings are Neotropical migratory birds. The availability of suitable habitats used during migration, as well as their winter habitat, are critical components. Status of habitats, effects of nonhabitat factors on populations, and management practices in migratory and wintering areas are, however, unknown.

**Population status and trends**—Recent BBS data indicate that the population was stable from 1968 to 1994 \((n \geq 14; P < 0.10)\) across the basin (Saab and Rich 1997). Sauer and others (1996) identified increasing trends for Lazuli buntings in the western United States from 1980 to 1995 \((+2.9 \text{ percent per yr, } n = 147; P < 0.01)\).
Figure 55—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 18 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of >60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 56—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 18, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by n.
Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integrating potential resource objectives for group 18 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—The results of our habitat trend analysis and the literature suggest the following issues are of high priority for group 18:

1. Altered frequency of stand-replacing fires.
2. Loss of shrub-dominated early-seral vegetation types.
3. Loss and degradation of riparian vegetation.

Potential strategies—The issues suggest the following broad-scale strategies would be effective in supporting the long-term persistence of the Lazuli bunting. Strategies would apply basin-wide.

1. (To address issue no. 1) Restore fire as an ecological process in the montane and lower montane community groups. Natural fire frequencies and intensities should be considered where appropriate.
2. (To address issue no. 2) Increase the representation of shrubs in the early-seral stages of forest communities.
3. (To address issue no. 3) Reduce impacts to shrubs from grazing, recreation, and other activities.

Practices that support strategies—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategy no. 1) Leave some postfire and postharvest areas unaltered to regenerate naturally.
2. (In support of strategy no. 2) Use prescribed fire to increase the representation of shrubs in the early-seral stages of forest communities.
3. (In support of strategy no. 3) Remove or explicitly control the timing and intensity of grazing to develop and promote the long-term persistence of shrub communities.
4. (In support of strategy no. 3) Restrict activities in riparian areas that negatively affect riparian vegetation. Areas that currently support healthy shrub communities should be a priority for conservation.

Group 19—Gray Wolf and Grizzly Bear

Results

Species ranges and source habitats—Group 19 consists of the grizzly bear and gray wolf. Historically, these two species ranged across most of the basin (fig. 57), although use of lower elevations within the Northern Great Basin and Owyhee Uplands ERUs was probably incidental. This distribution has been greatly reduced, and both species currently persist only in small, disjunct populations. Gray wolf populations occur in western Montana, central Idaho, and western Wyoming; grizzly bear populations remain in the northern Cascades, northern Idaho, western Montana, and western Wyoming (fig. 57).

The grizzly bear was listed as federally threatened under the ESA on July 28, 1975. The original recovery plan was approved in 1982 and amended in 1993. The northern Rocky Mountain gray wolf was listed as endangered on June 4, 1973, and a recovery plan was released in 1987 (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1987). Wolves have been state protected in Montana since 1975 and in Idaho since 1977 (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1987).

Source habitats for group 19 span a broad elevational range and include all terrestrial community groups except exotic herbland and agriculture. About 80 percent of all possible cover type-structural stage combinations are source habitats (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1).

Source habitats for wolves must include suitable denning and rendezvous sites and a sufficient, year-round prey base of ungulates and alternate prey (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1987). Den sites are used for rearing pups and are typically near forested cover and removed from human activity. Wolves are sensitive to human disturbance near dens from mid-April to July.
Figure 57—Ranges of species in group 19 within the basin (from Marcot and others, in prep.). For species whose ranges shifted significantly from historical conditions, separate maps are shown for historical and current ranges; otherwise, the current range map also denotes the historical range.
Rendezvous sites are resting and gathering areas used by wolf packs after the pups are mobile and typically include meadow vegetation and adjacent forest with resting sites under trees (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1987). Home ranges can be exceedingly large, based on estimates from radio telemetry. In Minnesota for example, home range estimates ranged from 49 to 135 km$^2$ (19 to 52 mi$^2$) (Van Ballenberghe and others 1975), and in Alberta, winter home ranges varied between 357 and 1779 km$^2$ (138 and 687 mi$^2$) (Fuller and Keith 1980).

The principal foods of wolves in the Rocky Mountains are deer, elk, and moose (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1987; Weaver 1994, cited in Weaver and others 1996). Grizzly bear habitat selection is affected by (1) abundance and quality of foods; (2) gender-specific orientation to different nutrients; (3) reproductive status of females and concerns about security of dependent young; (4) presence and identity of other bears, especially adult males; and (5) presence of humans and prior contact with humans. Grizzly bears are omnivorous, but their use of certain high-quality foods with limited spatial or temporal distribution often results in seasonal shifts in habitat selection (Hamer and Herrero 1987; Mace and others 1996; Mattson and others 1991a, 1991b; McLellan and Hovey 1995; Servheen 1983). Also, food availability fluctuates among years, and habitat selection may therefore differ from one year to the next (Green and others 1997; Mattson and others 1991a, 1991b; McLellan and Hovey 1995).

A selection process also seems to be used for the location of dens for hibernation and the birth and rearing of young. Typical dens are either dug by bears or occur in natural cavities in subalpine, montane, and rock community groups. Den sites tend to be clustered, thereby suggesting that certain areas possess more favorable combinations of environmental factors for denning (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1993). Grizzly home ranges encompass large areas. For example, based on several studies, annual home ranges of males in the Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem are between 165 and 1406 km$^2$ (64 and 543 mi$^2$), with an average of 489 km$^2$ (189 mi$^2$) (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1993).

**Broad-scale changes in source habitats**—Source habitats for the grizzly bear and gray wolf likely occurred throughout the basin historically (fig. 58A). The current extent of habitat, albeit largely unoccupied, is similar to the historical distribution except for the Columbia Plateau, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork ERUs, where habitat is more patchily distributed than it was historically (fig. 58B).

Basin-wide, the overall trend in source habitats for group 19 was neutral (fig. 58C). Source habitats remained relatively stable in 9 of 13 ERUs (figs. 58C and 59). Fifty percent of all watersheds, located primarily in the southern half of the basin and along the western and northern borders, showed no trend in habitat (fig. 59). Source habitats were projected to have decreased in four ERUs: the Columbia Plateau, Lower Clark Fork, Upper Clark Fork, and Upper Snake (fig. 59).

**Interpreting Results**

**Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats**—Despite the overall neutral trend for source habitats for group 19, many of the terrestrial communities were projected to have changed dramatically from historical conditions. In general, mid-seral forests increased in areal extent basin-wide, whereas both early- and late-seral forests declined (Hann and others 1997). Some forest cover types, including western white pine, whitebark pine, western larch, and limber pine no longer occur in stands large enough to map at the broad scale, whereas Pacific silver fir—mountain hemlock and western redcedar—western hemlock increased, respectively, 1,700 and 853 percent basin-wide (Hann and others 1997).

Within nonforest terrestrial communities, upland herbland and upland shrubland both strongly declined, whereas three new terrestrial communities, urban, agriculture, and exotic herbland, have emerged since the historical period (Hann and others 1997). Examples of declining nonforest cover types are native forb and mountain big sagebrush, which declined, respectively, by 91 and 34 percent basin-wide (Hann and others 1997). Within the four ERUs having overall declining trends in source habitats for group 19, declines were mostly in western white pine, whitebark pine, western larch, limber pine, big sagebrush, and native forb (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4).
Figure 58—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 19 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 59—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 19, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by n.
Other factors affecting the group—Human-caused mortality is the major factor limiting the recovery of wolves and grizzly bears (Fritts and Mech 1981; Knight and others 1988; Mattson and others 1996a, 1996b; Pletscher and others 1997; USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1987, 1993). About 84 percent of all known mortalities of wolves on the Montana-British Columbia-Alberta border were human caused, primarily legal shootings in Canada (Pletscher and others 1997). In the northern Rockies, between 1974 and 1996, 85 to 94 percent of all deaths of marked grizzly bears >1 year old were due to humans (Mattson and others 1996a).

For wolves, human-caused losses are due to shooting, trapping, and vehicle accidents (Fritts and others 1985). Six of the nine mortalities that occurred in the first 20 months after the reintroduction into Yellowstone National Park were human caused: three wolves were illegally shot, one was killed by Animal Damage Control personnel after repeated sheep depredations, and two were killed by vehicles (Bangs and Fritts 1996). In many cases, wolf mortalities are related to real and perceived depredations of livestock.

For grizzly bears, human-caused mortalities stem from (1) direct human-bear conflicts in wilderness areas and parks (for example, hikers, photographers, or hunters); (2) attraction of grizzly bears to improperly stored food or garbage; (3) attraction of grizzly bears to improperly disposed dead livestock; (4) chance interactions between livestock and grizzly bears; (5) increased human occupancy of grizzly bear habitat, causing increased interactions and stress; and (6) hunting (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1993). Legal hunting of grizzly bears no longer occurs in the basin, but grizzly bears are taken by poachers and occasionally are mistakenly shot during the black bear hunting season.

Wolves, particularly juveniles, are susceptible to canine parvovirus and distemper, and these diseases could affect recovery in the northern Rocky Mountains if not monitored (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1987). Parasites and diseases do not appear to be significant causes of natural mortality of grizzly bears (Jonkel and Cowan 1971, Rogers and Rogers 1976, both cited in USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1993).

Both species are negatively affected by roads. Roads per se are not a physical barrier; wolves use gated roads as travel corridors (Thurber and others 1994), and grizzly bears in Montana exhibit neutral or positive selection for areas with roads having <10 vehicles per day (Mace and others 1996). Roads, however, usually increase human presence and the likelihood of negative contacts. A disproportionate number of human-caused mortalities occur near roads, both for wolves (Mech 1970, as cited in Frederick 1991) and grizzly bears (Mattson and others 1996a). These mortalities are mostly legal and illegal shootings resulting from human access provided by roads (Mace and others 1996, McLellan and Shackleton 1988); vehicle collisions also play a role (Bangs and Fritts 1996, Knight and others 1988). Thurber and others (1994) cited three studies (Jensen and others 1986, Mech and others 1988, Thiel 1985) indicating wolf packs would not persist where road densities exceeded about 1.0 mi per mi² (0.6 km per km²).

An additional, indirect effect of roads is that road avoidance leads to underutilization of habitats that are otherwise high quality. Mace and others (1996) found that grizzly bears in Montana avoided roads having >10 vehicles per day. In southeastern British Columbia, grizzly bears underutilized about 9 percent of available habitats by avoiding areas 100 m (328 ft) from roads, regardless of traffic volume (McLellan and Shackleton 1988). Several other studies have documented road avoidance by grizzly bears in or near the basin (Green and others 1997, Kasworm and Manly 1990, Mattson and Reinhart 1997, Mattson and others 1987). Similar effects have been observed with wolves: packs in the Great Lakes region avoided habitats with high road and human densities even though densities of deer, a principal prey, were also high in these areas (Mladenoff and others 1995). In northern Montana, wolf travelways were at least 4 to 22 km (2.5 to 13.6 mi) from the nearest driveable road, which precluded their use of otherwise high-quality habitats and food resources (Singer 1979).

Road access also increases the likelihood of habituation to humans. Individual wolves and grizzly bears can become accustomed to human presence, leading to nuisance situations that can result in the death of the habituated animal (Mattson and others 1992, Meagher and Fowler 1989).

The neutral trends in source habitats projected for the basin do not reflect loss of habitat effectiveness because of roads and human activities. Road densities in the basin have substantially increased from historical levels and are estimated to be moderate to high in
most ERUs (Hann and others 1997). Moreover, the human population in the basin has increased and is estimated currently at 3 million (McCool and others 1997). The increase in road densities and human population are believed responsible for the unoccupied state of many source habitats of grizzly bears and wolves in the basin. For example, Merrill and others (1999) included roads, level of human activity, and distance and size of nearby human populations in their model of environmental suitability for grizzly bears in Idaho.

The demographic impact of human-caused mortality is intensified for grizzly bears by their low reproductive rate. Litters range from one to four cubs with an average of two, and females generally do not begin to reproduce until 5.5 yr old (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1993). Each female has the limited potential of adding three to four females to a population during her lifetime (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1993). Using this demographic information in conjunction with behavioral plasticity in food acquisition and dispersal capabilities, Weaver and others (1996) concluded that grizzly bears have fairly low resiliency to human disturbances, whereas gray wolves, based on these same factors, are moderately resilient.

Lack of connectivity among habitat reserves is a major factor affecting the long-term persistence of grizzly bears, and perhaps also wolves (Noss and others 1996). Source habitats are currently fragmented by human disturbances to a level where interchange within the entire regional population occurs rarely if at all (Noss and others 1996). Small, isolated populations are susceptible to extirpation from inbreeding, chance breeding events (for example, no female births in a given year), and environmental uncertainty (for example, drought or disease) (Shaffer 1981). This appears to be a concern for small, isolated grizzly bear populations (Allendorf and others 1991, cited in Mattson and others 1996b). Insufficient connectivity among local populations reduces the likelihood of recolonization once a population has been extirpated. The Bitterroot ecosystem is an example of a recent extirpation with extremely low probability of recolonization because of lack of connectivity with other grizzly bear populations (Merrill and others 1999).

Ultimately, human attitudes towards wolves and grizzly bears are what will ensure their survival or extirpation (Bangs and Fritts 1996, Mattson and others 1996a). Many of the negative effects of roads and human activities could be diminished through changes in human attitudes and behavior (Mattson and others 1996a, 1996b).

Population status and trends—Wolf populations were reduced to near extinction within the basin during the 1800s to early 1900s (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1987). Wolf numbers have increased, however, within the last 10 years. In addition to natural recolonizations of historical habitats in Washington, Idaho, and northwestern Montana (Marcot and others 1997), wolves have been reintroduced to central Idaho and the Yellowstone area as nonessential experimental populations (Federal Register 1994) beginning in 1995. Natural and experimental populations are currently doing well in all three areas identified for recovery: northwestern Montana, north-central Idaho, and the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. As of 1999 (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1999), northwestern Montana had about 65 wolves and 5 confirmed breeding pairs; central Idaho contained 140 wolves and 10 confirmed breeding pairs; and the Yellowstone ecosystem contained about 120 wolves and 8 breeding pairs.

Between 1800 and 1975, grizzly bear populations in the lower 48 States receded from estimates of over 100,000 to <1,000 bears (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1993). Extirpations within the basin include Utah (1923) and Oregon (1931) (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1993). The Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee6 identified five recovery zones south of Canada where grizzly bears and grizzly habitat are managed for recovery, and within which the population parameters will be monitored (Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee 1998). The recovery zones are referred to as ecosystems to emphasize the ecological rather than jurisdictional nature of their boundaries (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1993). Four of the recovery zones are within the basin—the Northern Cascades, Selkirk, Cabinet-Yaak, and Northern Continental Divide ecosystems—and the fifth, the Yellowstone ecosystem, occurs on the eastern border of the United States. The Northern Continental Divide ecosystem includes a large portion of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem.

---

6 The Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee is composed of top officials from the U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Indian Affairs; U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service; state fish and game agencies of Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, and Washington; and management authorities from British Columbia and Alberta.
of the basin. The Selway-Bitterroot ecosystem is under consideration as a recovery zone, as outlined in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for Grizzly Bear Recovery in the Bitterroot Ecosystem (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 2000).

Grizzly bear population estimates currently are available only for the Northern Continental Divide Grizzly Bear ecosystem (440 to 680 bears) (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1993) and the Yellowstone ecosystem (280 to 610 bears) (Eberhardt and Knight 1996). The Selkirk Mountains and Cabinet-Yaak ecosystems are believed to have breeding populations based on sightings of females with young, but populations within each ecosystem may be less than 20 grizzly bears (Knick and Kasworm 1989, Wielgus and Bunnell 1995). Population status within the Northern Cascades is unknown (Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee 1998, USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1993). No grizzly bears currently live in the Bitterroot Mountains of Idaho (Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee 1998).

Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integrating potential resource objectives for group 19 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—The following issues have been identified as major challenges to the conservation of the grizzly bear and gray wolf:

1. Excessive mortality from conflicts with humans.
2. Excessive mortality related to the presence of roads (accidents, poaching, and increased conflicts).
3. Displacement from suitable habitats because of human activities.
4. Isolation of populations within each recovery area.

The goal of the revised Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan is to identify actions necessary for the conservation and recovery of the grizzly bear and to remove the grizzly bear from threatened status in each recovery zone (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1993). The goal of the recovery plan for gray wolves is to remove the Northern Rocky Mountain wolf from the endangered and threatened species list by securing and maintaining a minimum of 10 breeding pairs of wolves in each of the three recovery areas for a minimum of 3 successive years (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1987).

Potential strategies—The following strategies could be used in the Northern Cascades, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Upper Clark Fork, Lower Clark Fork, Central Idaho Mountains, and Snake Headwaters ERUs to support recovery of the gray wolf and grizzly bear:

1. (To address issue no. 1) Reduce the prevalence of conflict situations and the number of human-caused mortalities of bears and wolves. Provide secluded habitats that reduce the potential for conflicts with humans.

2. (To address issue no. 2) Develop a policy for road construction, maintenance, and obliteration on public lands within gray wolf and grizzly bear recovery areas and in source habitats that surround and could potentially connect these habitats.

3. (To address issue no. 3) Reduce human activities in important grizzly bear foraging areas and around known wolf dens.

4. (To address issue no. 4) Provide interregional habitat connectivity across all ERUs with wolf and bear populations (Northern Cascades, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Upper Clark Fork, Lower Clark Fork, Central Idaho Mountains, and Snake Headwaters).

Practices that support strategies—Action items and practices for the recovery of the gray wolf and grizzly bear are in the Northern Rocky Mountain Wolf Recovery Plan (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1987), the Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1993), the Interagency Grizzly Bear Guidelines (Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee 1986) and the Grizzly Bear Compendium (LeFranc and others 1987). The following practices have been drawn from these documents as examples and would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategy no. 1) Alter the timing and location of livestock grazing to reduce the need for wolf and grizzly bear depredation control.
2. (In support of strategy no. 1) Implement sanitation practices, including law enforcement to support these practices, to minimize the likelihood of grizzly bear attraction to human food, garbage, and dead livestock.

3. (In support of strategy no. 1) Increase extent and scope of public education programs regarding the role of human-bear and human-wolf conflicts in the conservation of these species.

4. (In support of strategies no. 1 and no. 2) Minimize or avoid road construction within unroaded areas in grizzly bear ecosystems and wolf recovery areas. Obliterate or restrict use of roads in important seasonal habitats, such as low-elevation riparian areas (spring habitat for grizzly bears).

5. (In support of strategies no. 1 and no. 3) Reduce or temporarily discontinue activities such as livestock grazing, timber harvests, backcountry use, mining, and oil and gas development in important grizzly bear foraging areas during peak foraging periods. Restrict human access near wolf dens from April 15 to July 1.

6. (In support of strategy no. 4) Use concepts described in Noss and others (1996) to create habitat connectivity among recovery areas. Identify existing and potential dispersal corridors for wolves and bears, and seek opportunities with all landowners and parties to modify the timing, intensity, and location of human activities within these corridors.

Group 20—Mountain Goat

Results

Species ranges, source habitats, and special habitat features—Group 20 consists of the mountain goat, a year-round resident of the basin. Within the basin, the mountain goat occurs in the mountains of central and northeast Washington, northeast Oregon, central and northern Idaho, and western Montana. These areas correspond to five ERUs: the Northern Cascades, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, Upper Clark Fork, and Central Idaho Mountains (fig. 60). The range also includes small, bordering areas of the Southern Cascades and Columbia Plateau ERUs (fig. 60). Most populations are native, but mountain goats have been introduced into portions of Montana, and reintroduced into the Elkhorn and Blue Mountains of Oregon. Although the Hells Canyon population stems from a transplant, recent archeological evidence suggests historical occupancy of the Hells Canyon area and the Wallowa Mountains (Matthews and Coggins 1994).

Source habitats for mountain goats include 15 cover types within six community groups: alpine, subalpine forest, montane forest, lower montane forest, upland shrubland, and rock-barren (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Mountain goats show no apparent preference for any cover type, as long as they occur on steep terrain or near cliffs and talus. Mountain goats seem to use all structural stages within forested cover types except for the stem-exclusion stage of montane and lower montane forests (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Upland shrublands provide important foraging habitat, and forests provide both foraging habitat and protection from inclement weather (Johnson 1983).

Special habitat features identified for mountain goats are cliffs, talus, and seasonal wetlands (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2). Cliffs and talus are central to mountain goat distribution and habitat use (Hjelljord 1973). Cliffs provide escape terrain from predators (Johnson 1983, Rideout 1978), and both cliffs and talus provide foraging areas with little competition from other herbivores (Rideout 1978).


Broad-scale changes in source habitats—The following trends in source habitats for mountain goats were derived without reference to the proximity of cliffs and talus and therefore include habitat patches
Figure 60—Ranges of species in group 20 within the basin (from Marcot and others, in prep.). For species whose ranges shifted significantly from historical conditions, separate maps are shown for historical and current ranges; otherwise, the current range map also denotes the historical range.
that are not available to mountain goats. Trends derived from a restricted subset of habitats near cliffs could differ substantially in magnitude from those reported here, but the general direction of the trends likely would remain the same.

The historical distribution of source habitats was essentially the same as it is now, occurring in the mountains of central and northeast Washington, northeast Oregon, central and northern Idaho, and western Montana (figs. 61A, and 61B). Because mountain goats use various cover types, trends in the extent of source habitats differed basin-wide. Trends were projected to be neutral in 32 percent of the watersheds and positive in 42 percent of the watersheds basin-wide (fig. 62). Positive trends were projected in more than 50 percent of watersheds in the Blue Mountains and Central Idaho Mountains ERUs, and declining trends were most prevalent in the Lower Clark Fork and Upper Clark Fork ERUs (figs. 61C and 62). All other ERUs with source habitats exhibited mixed trends.

Source habitats for mountain goats were most prevalent in the Northern Cascades ERU historically, and this has not changed. The area occupied by source habitats in this ERU comprised 51 percent of the area of watersheds included in mountain goat range during both time periods (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 3).

Interpreting Results

Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats—Neutral trends in source habitats were partly because alpine and rock-barren community groups did not change in areal extent from historical to current periods (Hann and others 1997; vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). Within other community groups, neutral trends resulted from declines in some cover types that were offset by increases in other cover types used as source habitats. For example, in the Northern Cascades ERU, a major transition occurred from interior ponderosa pine to both interior Douglas-fir and grand fir-white fir (Hann and others 1997), but this resulted in static trends in habitat extent because all three cover types are source habitats (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1).

Declining trends in the Lower Clark Fork ERU were due to total losses at the broad scale of old forests of interior ponderosa pine, as well as declines in the stand-initiation stage of lodgepole pine and Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4).

Declines in the Upper Clark Fork were chiefly because of nearly total losses of interior Douglas-fir and interior ponderosa pine old forests (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). Although less extensive in area, strong declines in whitebark pine old forests also occurred in both the Lower and Upper Clark Fork ERUs (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). In the Central Idaho Mountains, increases in source habitat were primarily due to areal increases in Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir, grand fir-white fir, interior Douglas-fir, lodgepole pine, mountain mahogany, and shrub or herb-tree regeneration (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). Increases in the Blue Mountains were associated mostly with increases in grand fir-white fir (Hann and others 1997).

Condition of special habitat features—The areal extent of cliffs and talus has not changed between historical and current periods (Hann and others 1997). Seasonal wetlands are highly dependent on annual hydrologic cycles and therefore have fluctuated widely in occurrence and productivity over time.

Other factors affecting the group—Young of the year and yearlings incur the highest mortality rates, primarily because of harsh weather in conjunction with predation, internal parasites, and diseases (Johnson 1983). Adults are highly susceptible to hunting mortality, both legal and illegal (Kuck 1977, Matthews and Coggins 1994, Smith 1986, Swenson 1985).

Human activities disrupt mountain goats and can cause displacement from source habitats. Low-flying aircraft cause mountain goats to run, take alert defense postures, or take refuge under trees (Chadwick 1973). Road blasting and sonic booms also cause defensive reactions in mountain goats (Chadwick 1973). Mountain goats can become habituated to human disturbance, especially where they are not hunted, as in Glacier National Park (Pedivillano and others 1987, Singer and Doherty 1985), but more typically, mountain goats exhibit signs of stress when exposed to human disturbances. In Montana’s Rocky Mountain Front, mountain goat reproduction and kid survival was lower in a herd exposed to much human activity (such as energy exploration, a downhill ski resort, and developed recreation) compared to a herd in a more remote area (Joslin 1986).
Figure 61—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 20 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 62—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 20, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by $n$. 
Timber harvests can have both positive and negative effects on mountain goats. Overstory removal can increase forage productivity in areas where fire suppression has reduced the extent of open habitats (Johnson 1983). Sufficiently large stands of mature forests, however, must be retained for winter cover (Johnson 1983). Timber harvests also increase human access to mountain goat habitat through road construction (Chadwick 1973), and this has led to increased hunting mortality in some herds that were formerly less accessible (Johnson 1983).

Roads, particularly highways, also increase mortality rates through vehicle collisions (Singer 1978). In Glacier National Park, however, highway mortality was reduced by placing two highway underpasses on Highway 2 to allow goats to reach two mineral licks (Pedivillano and others 1987).

Many goat populations are small because of habitat fragmentation, hunting pressure, and the establishment of new herds with few individuals. A potential consequence of low numbers is a high probability of deleterious effects from inbreeding. For example, even after hunting of the Wallowa Mountain goat population was discontinued, the population remained static for many years until new genetic stock was introduced in the 1980s (Matthews and Coggins 1994).

Population status and trends—Mountain goat population trends differ across the basin. Populations in Washington7 and Montana8 have declined, whereas populations in the Wallowa and Elkhorn Mountains in northeastern Oregon have increased (Matthews and Coggins 1994). Native populations in Idaho have decreased, whereas introduced populations are stable or increasing.9

Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integrating potential resource objectives for group 20 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—Important issues affecting mountain goats were taken both from the literature and our habitat analysis.

1. Increased human disturbance in formerly isolated habitats.

2. Reduction in forage quantity and quality because of successional changes in source habitats from fire suppression.

3. Habitat fragmentation because of human land uses and successional changes in source habitats from fire suppression.

Potential strategies—

1. (To address issue no. 1) Reduce human activities, particularly where mountain goat herds are static or declining.

2. (To address issue no. 2) Restore quality and quantity of forage where forage has declined because of successional changes and changes caused by fire suppression.

3. (To address issue no. 3) Seek opportunities to reduce fragmentation in historical range caused by human land uses and fire suppression.

Practices that support strategies—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategy no. 1) Incorporate mitigation measures for human activities within or adjacent to known mountain goat herds into all relevant planning documents.

---


8 Personal communication. 1997. John McCarthy, special projects coordinator, Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, P.O. Box 200701, Helena, MT 59620-0701.

9 Personal communication. 1997. Lonn Kuck, wildlife game and research manager, Bureau of Wildlife, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, P.O. Box 25, Boise, ID 83707-0025.
2. (In support of strategy no. 1) Carefully regulate frequency and height of low-flying aircraft over known mountain goat herds, including military exercises, helicopter logging, recreational flights, and wildlife surveys.

3. (In support of strategies no. 2 and no. 3) Use understory thinning and prescribed burns to improve the quantity and quality of forage, and increase links with isolated herds.

4. (In support of strategy no. 3) Use land acquisitions, exchanges, and easements to consolidate blocks of suitable mountain goat habitat, including blocks of currently unoccupied habitat.

**Group 21—Long-Eared Owl**

**Results**

**Species ranges, source habitats, and special habitat features**—Group 21 is comprised of the long-eared owl. Long-eared owls are year-round residents of the basin, but some individuals move long distances suggestive of migratory behavior during fall and spring (Marks and others 1994). The current range of the long-eared owl includes all 13 ERUs (fig. 63).

Source habitats for the long-eared owl include a broad range of vegetation types from mid-elevational forests to low-elevational shrublands. The six vegetation community groups in which source habitats occur are montane forests, upland woodlands, upland shrublands, upland herblands, riparian woodlands, and riparian shrublands (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Source habitat cover types within the montane forest community include interior Douglas-fir, western larch, grand fir-white fir, Sierra Nevada mixed conifer, and red fir. Nearly all structural stages within these cover types except for managed young forests are considered source habitats.

Long-eared owls tend to nest and roost in dense vegetation, but they hunt almost exclusively in open habitats (Getz 1961, ICBEMP 1996h, Marks and others 1994, Thurow and White 1984). As such, they are considered a contrast species (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2), requiring a juxtaposition of contrasting vegetative
structure to meet all aspects of their ecology. Where forests are adjacent to open areas, trees are typically used for nest sites. Where forests are not present, nests are placed in tall shrubs (Holt 1997). This owl typically lays its eggs in abandoned stick nests of other species, especially common raven, American crow, and black-billed magpie nests (Marks and others 1994).

**Broad-scale changes in source habitats**—The historical distribution of source habitats was most concentrated in the Columbia Plateau, Northern Great Basin, and Owyhee Uplands (fig. 64A). The current distribution is about the same (fig. 64B), although significant declines have occurred in the northern half of the Columbia Plateau and in the eastern basin, and significant increases have occurred in the north, the central basin, and in the southwest (fig. 64C).

Trends in extent of source habitats are mixed across the basin: 29 percent of watersheds with source habitats showed no change in areal extent between the historical and current periods; 40 percent of watersheds had declining trends, and 31 percent had increasing trends (fig. 65). Four ERUs had declining and strongly declining trends in source habitats in >50 percent of watersheds. These were the Columbia Plateau (53 percent of watersheds), the Upper Clark Fork (75 percent of watersheds), the Upper Snake (76 percent of watersheds), and the Snake Headwaters (67 percent of watersheds). Increasing and strongly increasing trends occurred in >50 percent of watersheds in the Upper Klamath (63 percent of watersheds) and Blue Mountains (52 percent of watersheds) ERUs, and the Southern Cascades had increasing trends in 9 percent of watersheds (figs. 64C and 65).

**Interpreting Results**

**Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats**—Most vegetation types that provide source habitats for the long-eared owl have changed in extent from the historical period, but these changes have resulted in no net increase or decrease in source habitats.

Within the Upper Klamath, Blue Mountains, and Southern Cascades ERUs, increases in source habitats were largely due to increases in interior Douglas-fir, grand fir-white fir, juniper/sagebrush woodland, and big sagebrush (Hann and others 1997; vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). Declines in the northern portion of the Columbia Plateau and the Upper Snake are primarily due to transitions from big sagebrush to agriculture and the conversion of many cover types in the upland shrubland and riparian shrubland community groups to exotic forbs-annual grass (Hann and others 1997; vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). Declines in the Upper Clark Fork are due to increases in cropland and Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir cover types (Hann and others 1997), neither of which are source habitats for the long-eared owl, and declines in all structural stages of interior Douglas-fir (Hann and others 1997). Declines in the Snake Headwaters are due to transitions in both the upland herbland and upland shrubland communities to agriculture (Hann and others 1997).

**Condition of special habitat features**—No special habitat features were identified for the long-eared owl. The amount of edge habitat, however, may be a landscape-level variable of some importance to long-eared owls. The mid-scale analysis of vegetation changes in the basin (Hessburg and others 1999) indicated that the amount of edge increased significantly in 6 of 13 ERUs. Assuming that this scale of analysis is appropriate for long-eared owls, and assuming that inter-spesion of habitats is beneficial to this species, the increase in edge is considered a positive change in habitat condition.

**Other factors affecting the group**—The long-eared owl generally nests in trees, using stick nests created by other bird species, especially common raven, American crow, and black-billed magpie. Programs designed to reduce these species could therefore negatively affect the long-eared owl.

Little is known about effects of pesticides on this species. Henny and others (1984) discovered organochlorine residues in one-third of all long-eared owl eggs they examined.

Roads apparently do not impact long-eared owls. Mean distance to nearest road was not different for successful and unsuccessful nests (Marks 1986).

**Population status and trends**—Long-eared owls are common in most Western states, although they are considered rare in Montana (Craig and Trost 1979). Long-eared owl numbers appear to be stable in most states (Marti and Marks 1989). Within the basin, populations seem to attain peak densities in southern Idaho (Craig and Trost 1979).
Figure 64—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 21 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 65—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 21, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by n.
Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integrating potential resource objectives for group 21 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

**Issues**—The primary issue related to long-eared owl conservation is degradation and loss of native upland shrublands, riparian shrublands, and riparian woodlands.

**Potential strategies**—

1. Maintain and restore native upland shrublands, riparian shrublands, and riparian woodlands across the basin, particularly in the northern half of the Columbia Plateau and in the Upper Snake and Snake Headwaters ERUs.

**Practices that support strategies**—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. Limit livestock grazing and recreational activities in riparian shrublands and woodlands to allow growth of dense vegetation for nest sites.

2. Explore options under the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) (Johnson and Igl 1995), or develop other incentive programs, to encourage restoration of agricultural areas to native cover types.

3. Restore native vegetation by appropriate treatments and seedings of native shrub, grass, and forb species.

**Group 22—California Bighorn Sheep and Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep**

**Results**

**Species ranges, source habitats, and special habitat features**—Group 22 consists of two subspecies of bighorn sheep, the California and Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep; both are year-round residents of the basin. Although they use similar habitats, the two subspecies are separated by disparate ranges of remnant populations and by different geographic areas that have been designated for their reintroduction. In general, California bighorn occur in the western and southern portions of the basin, and Rocky Mountain bighorn occupy the eastern and northern portions of the basin (fig. 66).

Historically, California bighorns occurred in central and southeastern Oregon, the eastern slope of the Cascade Range in Washington, northwestern Nevada, and the mountains of southwestern Idaho (fig. 66). Populations declined in the late 1800s, and bighorns were extirpated from all four states between 1900 and 1930 (Thorne and others 1985). Because of a series of reintroductions, California bighorns currently are found in many disjunct populations within their former range (fig. 66).

Rocky Mountain bighorns historically occurred in northeastern Oregon, central Idaho, Montana and Wyoming, and northeastern Nevada (Thorne and others 1985) (fig. 66). After a severe population decline in the early 1900s, bighorns remained in only a few isolated areas of their former habitat. The current range represents an increase in occupied habitat since that time, because of a combination of reintroductions and protection of remnant populations (Thorne and others 1985). Much of the historical range, however, is still unoccupied (fig. 66).

Source habitats for both subspecies are primarily in the alpine, subalpine, upland shrubland, and upland herbland community groups. Old-forest and stand-initiation stages of whitebark pine are source habitat, but only the stand-initiation stage of other forest cover types is used (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Bighorn sheep prefer open habitats with short vegetation, both for high-quality forage (McWhirter and others 1992) and to maintain high visibility for predator avoidance (Risenhoover and Bailey 1985, Wishart 1978), and a negative correlation between forest cover and bighorn occurrence has been observed (Bentz and Woodard 1988). Postfire habitats can benefit bighorn sheep by improving forage quality (McWhirter and others 1992) and increasing visibility (Bentz and Woodard 1988).

In the basin, Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep exhibit more seasonal movements than do California bighorn sheep. Alpine and subalpine community groups are
Figure 66—Ranges of species in group 22 within the basin (from Marcot and others, in prep.). For species whose ranges shifted significantly from historical conditions, separate maps are shown for historical and current ranges; otherwise, the current range map also denotes the historical range.
primarily summer range for the Rocky Mountain subspecies, whereas upland herbland and shrubland are used in both seasons, depending on elevation (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1).

Special habitat features identified for these two subspecies include cliffs, talus, and seasonal wetlands (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2). The location of cliffs and talus ultimately defines the distribution of bighorn sheep because such features are essential for escape cover and the secure rearing of young (Wakelyn 1987). Cover types listed as source habitats (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1) generally are not available to bighorns unless they are near cliffs.

Broad-scale changes in source habitats—The following trends in source habitats for bighorn sheep were derived without reference to the proximity of cliffs and talus and may not accurately represent changes in the more restricted subset of stands available to bighorns. Trends derived from a restricted subset of habitats could differ substantially in magnitude from those reported here, but the general direction of the trends likely would remain the same.

Source habitats (regardless of proximity to cliffs) currently occupy the same general geographic extent as the historical distribution of habitats but are less prevalent within each watershed (figs. 67A, and 67B), thereby resulting in overall negative trends in habitat extent. Many areas that formerly had bighorn sheep habitat in 25 to 50 percent of each watershed now meet source habitat conditions in less than 25 percent of each watershed, particularly in the central and northern regions of the basin (fig. 67B). Habitats declined in 57 percent of the watersheds throughout the basin and in most watersheds in five ERUs: the Blue Mountains, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower and Upper Clark Fork, and Upper Snake (fig. 68). Declining trends also were noted in the Northern and Southern Cascades, but these ERUs are on the western edge of the geographic range and contain little habitat (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 3). Most watersheds of the Northern Great Basin and Owyhee Uplands ERUs exhibited no change in the amount of source habitats, whereas watersheds in the Snake Headwaters exhibited mixed trends in habitat extent (fig. 68).

Interpreting Results

Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats—Declines in source habitats were due primarily to declines in big sagebrush, mountain big sagebrush, fescue-bunchgrass, interior ponderosa pine, native forb, western larch, wheatgrass bunchgrass, whitebark pine-alpine larch, and whitebark pine (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). A notable change that has affected bighorn sheep is the widespread conversion of native shrublands and grasslands to agricultural cover types (Hann and others 1997), particularly in historical winter range. Also, source habitats with high visibility for predator avoidance have been replaced by stands with reduced visibility, primarily through the transition of whitebark pine old forests to Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir and the transition of stand-initiation stage forest cover types to mid-seral stages (Hann and others 1997).

Condition of special habitat features—Cliffs and talus (represented by the community group rock-barren) have not changed between historical and current periods (Hann and others 1997). Cliffs and talus can be significantly altered through direct human disturbance such as blasting and road construction, but this type of activity generally has not occurred in remote areas currently used by bighorn. Seasonal wetlands are highly dependent on annual hydrologic cycles and therefore have fluctuated widely in occurrence and productivity over time.

Other factors affecting the group—Bighorn sheep are highly susceptible to pneumonia after exposure to bacteria (*Pasteurella* spp.), viruses (*Parainfluenza* type-3), lungworm, and stress agents (Foreyt 1994, Wishart 1978). Major reductions or total extirpation of bighorn herds because of pneumonia outbreaks are well documented (Cassirer and others 1996, Coggins 1988, Onderka and Wishart 1984, Spraker and others 1984). A recent episode of *Pasteurella*-associated pneumonia in the Hells Canyon area resulted in a known loss of 327 bighorn sheep between November 1995 and March 1996, which represented 50 to 75 percent of four herds in Oregon and Washington (Cassirer and others 1996).

Abundant circumstantial evidence indicates that domestic and exotic sheep are the source of nonendemic bacteria and viruses predisposing bighorn sheep to pneumonia (Coggins 1988, Foreyt and Jessup 1982,
Figure 67—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 22 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 68—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 22, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by n.
Martin and others 1996); moreover, direct evidence recently has been acquired through experimental contact between sheep and bighorns in enclosures (Foreyt 1994), and through bacterial swab cultures and DNA analysis of Pasteurella spp. collected from free-ranging bighorn sheep with pneumonia in Nevada and Oregon (Rudolph and others, in prep.). Domestic goats also may be reservoirs, although the evidence is less compelling. A feral goat was associated with diseased bighorn at the start of the outbreak in Hells Canyon and had genetically identical Pasteurella to one of the bighorn ewes; however, these bacteria were not common among bighorns sampled during the episode (Cassirer and others 1996; Rudolph and others, in prep.).

Bighorn sheep also are affected by grazing competition from livestock (USDI Bureau of Land Management 1995). Intensive grazing pressure that occurred between the late 1800s and early 1900s is believed a factor in the reduction in bighorn sheep populations of that era (Johnson 1983). Grazing competition with domestic sheep has been reduced in recent times because of efforts to maintain buffers between sheep and bighorns to reduce the potential for disease transmission. The leading source of grazing competition is from cattle (Blood 1961, Demarchi 1965, and Lauer and Peek 1976, as cited in Van Dyke and others 1983). Late winter grazing by cattle, however, has proven beneficial to the Lower Imnaha bighorn herd in Oregon.10

The condition of bighorn sheep habitats has been altered over the last century because of changes in historical fire regimes. Fire suppression has resulted in an increase in the density of trees of formerly open stands, reducing forage quality and causing bighorns to avoid these areas because of reduced visibility. Some cliff areas are currently inaccessible to bighorns because the stands of open timber through which bighorns formerly traveled have developed into dense stands that bighorns avoid (Wakelyn 1987). For the Rocky Mountain bighorn, fire-suppressed stands have created barriers between historical winter and summer range, thereby preventing occupancy of the total range even though each isolated range is currently suitable (Wakelyn 1987).

Some historical ranges have become fragmented by urban, mining, agricultural, and recreational developments (USDI Bureau of Land Management 1995). In some cases, this has created a barrier between seasonal ranges, as described above for fire-suppressed habitat. Additionally, fragmentation has resulted in habitat islands that can support only small, isolated herds (USDI Bureau of Land Management 1995).

Direct disturbance by humans can affect bighorn sheep by shifting their distribution (Hamilton and others 1982, Hicks and Elder 1979) and by increasing physiologic stress (MacArthur and others 1979). Hunted populations generally react more strongly than nonhunted populations (Hamilton and others 1982, Hicks and Elder 1979). Among the human activities that elicit the strongest negative response are low-flying aircraft (helicopters and military air exercises). Hiking in lambing areas is also disruptive to bighorns (USDI Bureau of Land Management 1995). The human population in the basin has increased from a relatively small number of native people to 3 million (McCool and others 1997); therefore, the number of human disturbances in bighorn sheep habitat likely has increased.

Population status and trends—Bighorn sheep populations declined substantially throughout their geographic range in the late 1800s and early 1900s. However, because of the establishment of hunting regulations, a better understanding of disease transmission, and concentrated reintroduction efforts throughout the West, bighorn numbers have steadily increased over the last 50 years (Thorne and others 1985). By 1995, many reintroductions of California bighorn resulted in the establishment of 6 herds in Idaho, 29 herds in Oregon, and 8 herds in Washington (USDI Bureau of Land Management 1995).

Populations of Rocky Mountain bighorn also have been widely reintroduced into their historical habitats within the basin. As of 1995, the reintroduced and native populations comprised 10 herds in Idaho, 9 herds in Oregon (1 extends into Washington), 3 additional herds in Washington, and 9 herds in Montana (USDI Bureau of Land Management 1995).

---

10 Personal communication. 1998. Victor Coggins, regional wildlife biologist, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, 65495 Alder Slope, Enterprise, OR 97828.
Population trends differ by herd. Some reintroduced herds are still increasing; for example, the Pueblo Mountains herd in southeast Oregon currently numbers 130 and is still growing.\textsuperscript{11} This herd was started with three reintroductions in 1976, 1980, and 1983 that totaled 40 animals (Coggins and others 1996). Some herds have static trends; for example, the Steens Mountain bighorn herd was started with 11 animals in 1960 (Coggins and others 1996) and increased to 275 (USDI Bureau of Land Management 1995), but currently numbers 250 and seems to be static for unknown reasons (see footnote 11). Several herds in the Hells Canyon area of Washington and Oregon have recently declined because of an outbreak of Pasteurella-associated pneumonia (Cassirer and others 1996).

Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integrating potential resource objectives for group 22 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

\textbf{Issues}—Issues were taken from the literature and the results of our habitat analysis for these two subspecies.

1. Incompatibility with domestic sheep and possibly domestic goats because of the potential for disease transmission and competition for forage.

2. Reduction in forage quantity and quality because of successional changes in source habitats.

3. Habitat fragmentation (poor juxtaposition of seasonal ranges as well as isolation of small herds) because of successional changes in source habitats.

4. Habitat fragmentation because of agricultural, industrial, and recreational development.

5. Disturbance and habitat displacement because of human activities such as low aircraft fly-overs and hiking in lambing areas.

\textsuperscript{11} Personal communication. 1998. Ron Garner, assistant district wildlife biologist, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, P.O. Box 8, Hines, OR 97738.

\textbf{Potential strategies}—

1. (To address issue no. 1) Actively control the potential for disease transmission and forage competition between bighorns and domestic livestock.

2. (To address issue no. 2) Restore quality and quantity of forage where forage has declined because of successional changes in vegetation.

3. (To address issue no. 3) Restore habitat links between summer and winter range and access to escape cover that have been lost because of changes in historical fire regimes.

4. (To address issue no. 4) Seek opportunities to reduce fragmentation in historical range caused by human land uses.

5. (To address issue no. 5) Reduce human activities in key foraging and lambing areas.

\textbf{Practices that support strategies}—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategy no. 1) Avoid direct contact between bighorn sheep and domestic sheep and goats. Guidelines established by the BLM for domestic sheep management in bighorn sheep habitats (USDI Bureau of Land Management 1995) recommend that buffers (having no domestic sheep or goats) are placed around bighorn sheep habitat and that bighorn sheep reintroductions do not occur in areas that have been grazed by domestic sheep or goats within the last 2 years.

2. (In support of strategy no. 1) Reduce forage competition with livestock by factoring bighorn sheep forage consumption into total forage utilization. Light to moderate cattle grazing during spring or early summer can be used to improve forage quality on bighorn sheep winter ranges (Bodie and Hickey 1980).

3. (In support of strategies no. 2 and no. 3) Use understory thinning and prescribed burns to improve the quantity and quality of forage and to restore open habitat links between winter and summer ranges and to provide access to cliffs that currently are inaccessible to bighorns.
4. (In support of strategy no. 4) Use land acquisitions, exchanges, and easements to consolidate blocks of suitable bighorn sheep habitat (USDI Bureau of Land Management 1995).

5. (In support of strategy no. 5) Incorporate mitigation measures into all planning documents for mines, highways, canals, and recreational developments within or adjacent to occupied bighorn sheep range to minimize human disturbance.

6. (In support of strategy no. 5) Regulate activities that cause unacceptable disturbance to bighorns, such as flights of low-flying aircraft and back country recreation.

**Group 23—Rufous Hummingbird and Broad-Tailed Hummingbird**

**Results**

**Species ranges, source habitats, and special habitat features**—Group 23 consists of the rufous hummingbird and the broad-tailed hummingbird, both of which are migratory breeders in the basin. The rufous hummingbird is distributed throughout forested portions of the basin (fig. 69), whereas the range of the broad-tailed hummingbird is restricted to small areas of Idaho and Montana (fig. 69). Both of these species are mostly associated with coniferous forests. The rufous hummingbird is found in 12 coniferous forest types and occurs in 53 combinations of forest types and structural stages. The broad-tailed hummingbird has source habitats in four coniferous types: Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir, interior Douglas-fir, grand fir-white fir, and interior ponderosa pine (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). Within the forest types, both species use old forests, understory reinitiation, and stand initiation. Source habitats for both species also include shrub-wetlands and aspen, and each species uses some woodland types. These species generally are found in more open forests, forests with openings, or in areas where open areas and forest habitats are adjacent because it is within these areas that the potential for deciduous shrubs and herbs is higher. Deciduous shrubs and herbs provide important foraging substrates (flowers) for these birds.

Both species typically nest in conifers in areas that support an abundance of nectar-producing flowers, which serve as a foraging substrate. Nectar-producing flowers are a special habitat feature for hummingbirds (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2).

**Broad-scale changes in source habitats**—Historically, source habitats for group 23 were broadly distributed throughout the mountainous regions of the basin (fig. 70A). Currently, source habitats are still widely distributed but more concentrated in fewer watersheds in most of the ERUs (fig. 70B).

Overall, the projected trend in source habitats for group 23 declined from historical to present. Basin-wide, about 36 percent of the watersheds had strong declines in source habitats, and 19 percent had moderate declines (fig. 71). Eight ERUs were projected to have moderate or strong declines in source habitats in more than 50 percent of watersheds (fig. 71). More than 50 percent of the watersheds in the Upper Klamath and Northern Great Basin were projected to have moderate or strong increases (fig. 71). The Northern Cascades, Snake Headwaters, and Central Idaho Mountains generally had no change in amount of source habitats (fig. 71).

**Interpreting Results**

**Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats**—The increase in source habitats in the Upper Klamath and Northern Great Basin is directly related to an increase in late-seral montane forests (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). Decreases in source habitats in six ERUs are due primarily to reductions in late-seral ponderosa pine, western larch, and western white pine. Six ERUs (Southern Cascades, Upper Klamath, Columbia Plateau, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork) also showed substantial declines in early-seral forests, particularly ponderosa pine, western larch, and western white pine. Decreases in the Upper Snake resulted from declines in aspen (understory reinitiation) and chokecherry-serviceberry-rose. The decline in available source habitats in the Owyhee Uplands primarily was because of a decrease of about 2 percent in shrub-wetlands, but this figure may underrepresent the actual loss of habitat due to the small size of shrub-wetland patches relative to mapping unit size at the broad scale.
Figure 69—Ranges of species in group 23 within the basin (from Marcot and others, in prep.). For species whose ranges shifted significantly from historical conditions, separate maps are shown for historical and current ranges; otherwise, the current range map also denotes the historical range.
Figure 70—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 23 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 71—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 23, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by n.
Condition of special habitat features—An analysis of the abundance of nectar-producing flowers, the primary food source for these hummingbirds, is not possible at the scale of this analysis, and no information on condition or trend is available. The increasing trend in shade-tolerant, multi-storied stands likely decreased the abundance of forest-associated flowers by reducing the amount of sunlight needed for flower development.

Other factors affecting the group—Grazing has an overall negative impact on nectarivores because of these species’ dependence on understory plants as a food source. Negative effects of grazing on broad-tailed hummingbirds have been documented in two studies (Page and others 1978, Schulz and Leininger 1991, cited in Saab and others 1995). Negative responses to grazing also were reported for the rufous hummingbird (Page and others 1978, cited in Saab and others 1995).

Because both species are Neotropical migratory birds, habitat used during migration and winter also may influence population trends. Russell and others (1994) observed that the quality of “stopover” habitats for migrant rufous hummingbirds differs greatly because of the natural variation in flowering, and found a positive correlation between variation in flowering and hummingbird survival. Little is known about the abundance or trend of wintering habitat of these species.

Population status and trends—Based on BBS data from 1968 to 1994, rufous hummingbirds in the basin have shown stable population trends (Saab and Rich 1997). There are insufficient BBS data for the broad-tailed hummingbird to analyze population trends within the basin (Saab and Rich 1997). Specialized monitoring techniques are needed to track population trends for both species of hummingbirds.

Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integrating potential resource objectives for group 23 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—The following issues are drawn from our analysis of source habitat trends in combination with issues identified from other literature:

1. Decline in abundance of natural forest openings specifically within ponderosa pine, interior Douglas-fir, grand fir, and western larch. There also has been a nearly complete loss of open forests of western white pine (all structural stages).

2. Decline in abundance of forest-associated flowering plants because of exclusion of fire, establishment of shade-tolerant trees, and subsequent decrease in shrub and herbaceous understories.

3. Decline in abundance of understory flowering shrubs, particularly in riparian areas, because of cattle grazing.

Potential strategies—Habitat for rufous and broad-tailed hummingbirds would benefit from the following strategies that address the issues listed above:

1. (To address issue no. 1) Promote the development of forest openings and single-layered old-forest structures of ponderosa pine, interior Douglas-fir, grand fir, and western larch, particularly in the ERUs where source habitats have declined (Southern Cascades, Columbia Plateau, Blue Mountains, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork).

2. (To address issue no. 1) Increase the amount of early-seral forest in the ERUs where it has declined (Southern Cascades, Upper Klamath, Columbia Plateau, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork).

3. (To address issue no. 2) Restore fire as an ecological process to encourage development of forest openings and growth of shrubs and forbs.

4. (To address issue no. 3) Reduce impacts to flowering herbs and shrubs from grazing.

Practices that support strategies—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:
1. (In support of strategy no. 1) Remove shade-tolerant understory trees to promote stand health and longevity in old-forest stands. Hand removal, or in some cases prescribed burning, may be effective.

2. (In support of strategies no. 2 and no. 3) Accelerate development of flowering shrubs and forbs with the use of prescribed underburning and thinning, or allow for natural wildfires to occur particularly in the following ERUs: Southern Cascades, Columbia Plateau, Blue Mountains, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, Upper Clark Fork, Owyhee Uplands, and the Upper Snake.

3. (In support of strategies no. 2 and no. 3) Select areas that have been burned by wildfire or harvested for timber, and try to extend the duration of the early-seral stage, which is rich in forbs and shrubs, by not planting conifers. Areas of primary importance are the Southern Cascades, Upper Klamath, Columbia Plateau, Northern Glaciated Mountains, Lower Clark Fork, and Upper Clark Fork.

4. (In support of strategy no. 4) Remove or explicitly control the timing and intensity of grazing to develop and promote the long-term persistence of shrub communities.

**Group 24—Sharptail Snake, California Mountain Kingsnake, and Black-Chinned Hummingbird**

**Results**

**Species ranges, source habitats, and special habitat features**—Group 24 consists of three species that primarily depend on open forest and woodland habitats: the black-chinned hummingbird, the sharptail snake, and the California mountain kingsnake. The range of the black-chinned hummingbird covers the entire basin except the high elevations of the Cascade Mountains in both the Northern and Southern Cascades ERUs and the high elevations of the northern Rocky Mountains (fig. 72). Both species of snakes occur in scattered, isolated populations along the eastern slope of the Cascade Range (fig. 72). The two species of snakes are only known to occur in the same location near the Columbia River Gorge.

These three species primarily group together based on their consistent use of interior ponderosa pine, and interior Douglas-fir vegetation types in all structural stages except stem-exclusion, closed-canopy forests. They also use mixed-conifer woodlands and Oregon white oak (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1).

The black-chinned hummingbird is the only member of the group whose source habitats include juniper, juniper/sagebrush, chokecherry-serviceberry-rose, mountain mahogany, shrub wetlands, and old-forest aspen (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1). The sharptail snake uses more source habitats than the kingsnake, including nearly all seral stages of cottonwood-willow (also used by the black-chinned hummingbird), nearly all structural stages of western redcedar-western hemlock, and the stem-exclusion, closed-canopy, and stand-initiation structural stages of western larch (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 1).

Logs and talus are special habitat features for both species of snakes because of their dependency on moist environments (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2). In the absence of nearby streams, microhabitats with higher moisture are found under logs and within talus (Brown and others 1995). These features also provide protection from predators and habitat for potential prey. Additionally, deciduous tree riparian is also a special habitat feature for the sharptail snake (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2).

Nectar-producing flowers are considered a special habitat feature for the black-chinned hummingbird because of the dependence on nectar as a primary food source (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 2).

**Broad-scale changes in source habitats**—Because the distribution of the two species of snakes is restricted to a few disjunct locations, the results of our analysis for this group are primarily based on source habitats for the black-chinned hummingbird, which is widely distributed throughout the basin both historically (fig. 73A) and currently (fig. 73B). Source habitats are most abundant in northeastern Washington, the Upper Klamath, and central Oregon (figs. 73A, and 73B).

Overall, source habitats appeared to increase since the historical period, primarily in Oregon, Washington, and southeastern Idaho, whereas much of northern and central Idaho and Montana experienced declines (fig. 73C). About 53 percent of the watersheds basin-wide were projected to have increasing trends (fig. 74). The
Figure 72--Ranges of species in group 24 within the basin (from Marcot and others, in prep.). For species whose ranges shifted significantly from historical conditions, separate maps are shown for historical and current ranges; otherwise, the current range map also denotes the historical range.
Figure 73—Percentage of area identified as source habitats, historically (A) and currently (B), and the relative change in percentage of area of source habitats from historical to current periods (C), for group 24 within each of 2,562 watersheds in the basin. Relative change for each watershed is shown as one of five trend categories, where -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent.
Figure 74—Percentage of watersheds within five trend categories of relative change in source habitats from historical to current periods for group 24, basin-wide and by ecological reporting units. Trend categories correspond to the following relative changes from historical to current periods: 2 = an increase of ≥60 percent; 1 = an increase of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; 0 = an increase or decrease of <20 percent; -1 = a decrease of ≥20 percent but <60 percent; and -2 = a decrease of ≥60 percent. Number of watersheds from which estimates were derived is denoted by n.
three ERUs with declining trends were Lower and Upper Clark Fork and Central Idaho Mountains (fig. 74), whereas mostly neutral trends were projected for the Blue Mountains and Northern Glaciated Mountains ERUs (fig. 74).

Interpreting Results

Composition and structure of vegetation associated with changes in source habitats—Changes in broad-scale habitat trends differed across the basin because of the wide array of cover types and structural stages used by group 24. Declining trends were fairly consistent for interior ponderosa pine old forest (both multi- and single-storied), and for stand-initiation stages of both ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir. Increases in habitat occurred in nearly all ERUs in both ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir young forests and in all woodland types (vol. 3, appendix 1, table 4). The increase in woodlands contributed substantially to the overall increase in source habitats, especially in rangeland-dominated ERUs (Upper Klamath, Northern Great Basin, Columbia Plateau, Snake Headwaters, and parts of the Blue Mountains). The increase in source habitats for group 24 closely reflects the increase in upland woodland reported for the basin (see map 3.58 in Hann and others 1997).

Condition of special habitat features—Trends in the condition of logs, talus, and flowers are not available at the broad scale. Activities that may negatively affect these variables include timber harvesting, road building, grazing, mining, and fire suppression. Timber harvesting and road building can lead to the direct removal of logs and flowers; mining can lead to disturbance of talus. Fire suppression can impact flower abundance by increasing forest canopy closure and reducing the amount of sunlight needed for flower development on herbaceous plants in the understory.

Other factors affecting the group—Humans have directly affected snakes through collection, harassment, and accidental mortalities. Because of its striking coloration, the California mountain kingsnake is in demand by collectors (ICBEMP 1996a). Humans also intentionally kill various snake species because of fear and hate, and are responsible for unintentional mortality caused by motorized vehicles (Brown and others 1995).

Population isolation was raised as a concern by the viability panel that evaluated sharptail snakes (ICBEMP 1996b). Although the viability panel did not evaluate the California mountain kingsnake, the same concerns and considerations are presumably important for this species because of its patchy and restricted range in the basin.

Because the black-chinned hummingbird is a Neotropical migrant, habitat used during migration and wintering habitat could impact its populations. In a study on migrating rufous hummingbirds, researchers found a correlation between abundance of nectar-producing flowers and hummingbird survival in habitat used during migration (Russell and others 1994). A similar correlation likely exists with black-chinned hummingbirds. Little is known about the abundance or trends of the wintering habitat of the black-chinned hummingbird.

Heavy grazing has had an overall negative impact on nectarivores by reducing the density of understory plants used as a food source (Saab and others 1995). Direct effects on the black-chinned hummingbird are unknown.

Population status and trends—There are no estimates of population change for either the sharptail snake or the California mountain kingsnake within the basin. According to Brown and others (1995), however, loss of snake habitat and population declines in snakes worldwide have increased because of the increased paving of roads, fast cars, intensive agriculture, urban sprawl, desertification of arid lands, deforestation of the tropics, pesticides, hobby collecting, rattlesnake “roundups,” and a general aversion to snakes. Sharptail snakes have declined in the Willamette Valley of Oregon, just west of the basin (Marshall and others 1996, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife 1987).

Population trend estimates for the black-chinned hummingbird in the basin are not available because of insufficient data from established BBS routes (Saab and Rich 1997). Specialized monitoring techniques would be needed to adequately measure population trends because they are difficult to detect (Saab and Rich 1997).
Management Implications

The following issues, strategies, and practices may be useful to managers as a starting point for integrating potential resource objectives for group 24 with broader, ecosystem-based objectives for all other resources on FS- and BLM-administered lands in the basin.

Issues—Although the results of our analysis show an increase in source habitats across the basin, other sources of information have indicated that habitat and populations have decreased since the historical period. The trend of special habitat features for these species may affect populations more strongly than the broad-scale changes in source habitats. The following are issues that relate to special habitat features and other management concerns:

1. Loss of down logs and surface litter used by snakes as a result of timber harvest.
2. Loss of habitat connectivity for snakes as a result of habitat loss and road construction.
3. Decline in availability of understory flowering shrubs, particularly in riparian areas, because of cattle grazing.
4. Decreases in natural forest openings and shrub understories because of exclusion of fire and invasions by shade-tolerant trees.
5. Collection of California mountain kingsnakes.

Potential strategies—The issues identified above suggest the following broad-scale strategies to maintain the long-term persistence of sharptail snakes, California mountain kingsnakes, and black-chinned hummingbirds:

1. (To address issue no. 1) Survey and manage for downed logs and litter for the two species of snakes.
2. (To address issue no. 2) Seek opportunities to improve connectivity between isolated populations of both the sharptail snake and California mountain kingsnake.
3. (To address issue no. 3) Maintain and restore flowering herbs and shrubs in areas that have been negatively affected by cattle grazing.
4. (To address issue no. 4) Restore fire as an ecological process, particularly in interior ponderosa pine and interior Douglas-fir plant communities, to encourage forest openings that are occupied by flowering shrubs and forbs.

Practices that support strategies—The following practices would be effective in implementing the strategies listed above:

1. (In support of strategy no. 1) Maintain and protect down logs at a level that is ecologically sustainable and meets the habitat requirements for snakes.
2. (In support of strategy no. 2) Close roads to minimize human disturbance and maximize dispersal capabilities, particularly in areas known to be occupied by either sharptail snakes or California mountain kingsnakes.
3. (In support of strategy no. 3) Remove or explicitly control the timing and intensity of grazing to develop and promote the long-term persistence of shrub communities.
4. (In support of strategies no. 3 and no. 4) Accelerate development of flowering shrubs and forbs by the use of prescribed underburning and thinning, or allow for natural wildfires to occur, particularly in the Douglas-fir and ponderosa pine plant communities. Highest priorities for following these practices are in the Lower Clark Fork, Upper Clark Fork, and Central Idaho Mountains ERUs.

Group 25—Northern Goshawk (Winter)

Results

Species ranges and source habitats—Group 25 consists of winter habitat for the northern goshawk. Summer habitat for the northern goshawk is described in group 5. During winter, the range of the goshawk is basin-wide (fig. 75). Throughout North America, little is known about goshawks in winter, but indications are that northern goshawks are partial migrants. Some of the population regularly winters outside the