WILDLIFE ECOLOGY TEAM

WILDLIFE HABITAT RELATIONSHIPS IN WASHINGTON AND OREGON FISCAL YEAR 2014.

October, 2014

STUDY

Demography of Spotted Owls on the east slope of the Cascade Range, Washington, 1989-2014

RESEARCHERS

Dr. E.D. Forsman (PI). Lead Biologist: S. Sovern, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon. Biologists M. Taylor, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon; Joan StHilaire and Dale Phipps, USDA Forest Service. Cooperators: Plum Creek Timber Company, Boise Cascade Corporation, American Forest Resources L.L.C., Washington State Department of Natural Resources.

STATUS

This study is one of eight long-term demographic studies in the Regional Monitoring Program for the Northern Spotted Owl (Lint et al. 1999). The study was initiated in 1989.

STUDY OBJECTIVES

Determine demographic trends of Spotted Owls on the east slope of the Cascade Range in Washington, to include age-and-sex-specific survival rates, reproductive rates, and overall population trend.

POTENTIAL BENEFIT OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to collect long-term information on survival and reproductive rates of Spotted Owls on the east slope of the Cascade Mountains in Washington. This information is needed to assess the status of the owl population in this province. In combination with data from other study areas in Washington and Oregon, information from the Cle Elum Study Area is used to assess region-wide trends in the Spotted Owl population (Forsman et al. 1996, Franklin et al. 1999, Lint et al. 1999, Anthony et al., 2006, Forsman et al. 2011). The long-term dataset obtained during this study has provided the baseline for a pilot study of the effect of Barred Owl removal on Spotted Owl demographics (see below).

STUDY AREA AND METHODS

The Cle Elum Study Area includes a 1,787 km^2 General Study Area (GSA), and a 204 km^2 Density Study Area (DSA) that is contained within the GSA (Figure 1). The U. S. Forest Service administers approximately 60% of the area within the GSA. The GSA and DSA are composed of 34 % and 88 % designated Late Successional Reserves (LSR), respectively. These LSR's were allocated by the Northwest Forest Plan to benefit species associated with late successional forest (USDA and USDI 1994).



Figure 1. The Cle Elum Study Area, Washington, USA.

In October 2013, the Washington State Department of Natural Resources purchased more than 20,000 ha (~ 50,000 acres) of private land located mostly in the Teanaway River Drainage. The most recent landowner of these parcels was American Forest Holdings LLC., but the land was originally owned by Boise Cascade Corp. In October, 2014, The Nature Conservancy purchased over 19,000 ha (~ 48,000 acres) of land formerly owned by Plum Cr. Timber. These 2 purchases effectively assigned the management of nearly all private lands within the GSA to these 2 entities. We are optimistic that the future will include new perspectives for managing Spotted Owl habitat on these former private lands.

Within the GSA we survey all historic owl territories each year using standard protocols to locate and confirm previously banded owls, and to determine the number of young produced at each territory (Forsman 1983, Franklin, et al., 1996, Lint et al., 1999). Any new owls are banded with a numbered USFWS band and a uniquely colored plastic leg band (Figure 2). We attempted a complete count of Spotted Owls in the DSA each year beginning in 1991. The DSA survey involves reproducing Spotted Owl calls at each established call station on 3 occasions during the March – August field season (Forsman 1983, Lint et al. 1999, Reid et al. 1999). Call stations are positioned to achieve a 100 % auditory coverage of the entire DSA.

Figure 2. Adult Spotted owl with yellow and black leg band

In 2005 and 2006, we collected blood samples and oral swabs from most owls we captured to test for the presence of West Nile Virus. West Nile Virus has been identified as a potentially significant source of mortality among Spotted Owls (Courtney et al. 2004). We collected blood samples from some captured owls for future genetic study 2006-2010 (Haig et al. 2004, Funk et al. 2009).

In January, 2014, we participated in the sixth workshop to analyze Northern Spotted Owl data, which took place in Corvallis, Oregon. This meta-analysis included data from 8 monitoring areas funded through the Northwest Forest Plan, plus 3 additional study areas in the range of the Northern Spotted Owl. During the meta-analysis, we used mark-recapture data to estimate age-and sex-specific survival and recruitment, and population growth rate. We also included an occupancy analysis (MacKenzie et al. 2002) for the first time. The results of this workshop will be compiled and submitted to a peer-reviewed journal for publication. The last workshop occurred in 2009, and the results from that analysis were published in Forsman et al. (2011).

RESULTS

Population Trends

General Study Area

In 2014 we banded 5 juvenile owls and 2 adult owls, bringing the total number of owls banded during 1989-2014 to 857 (161 adults , 69 subadults, and 627 juveniles, Table 1). Our monitoring effort has remained relatively consistent after 1992, except for 8-10 territories we began monitoring with only 1 visit per year beginning in 2002. None of these “minimum-protocol” territories contained owls in 2014. We confirmed the bands of 14 Spotted Owls, and detected another 4 Spotted Owls on 11 territories. This compares to a high of 120 owls on 64 territories in the same area in 1992 (a decline of 85%,Figures 3,4 Table 2). The high male:female ratio observed in 2008-2010 appears to have waned in the last 4 years (Figure 5). It is somewhat encouraging that the number of owls detected has remained relatively stable (18-21 owls) for 4 years. It

remains to be seen whether the current population size in this area is large enough to remain stable considering the inevitable stochastic processes the population will face in the future. For example, 2 large fires burned most of the remaining habitat in 2 historic owl territories in 2014.

Key findings of the 2009 meta-analysis of Spotted Owl demography data (Forsman et al. 2011) were: 1) there was strong evidence of population declines in Spotted Owls on 7 of 11 study areas examined (including the Cle Elum Study Area); and 2) Barred Owl presence had a generally negative effect on demographic rates of Spotted Owls. The estimate of the finite rate of population change (λ) for the Cle Elum Study Area was 0.937 (95% CI 0.91 – 0.96), indicating an annual population decline of 6.3% (95% CI 4-9%). This estimate of population change closely predicts the empirical estimates of population size that we collect each year (Figure 3).



Figure 3. Number of Spotted Owls detected, number of territories in which we detected owls, number of territories surveyed, and number of new territories added by year on the Cle Elum Study Area, Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, Washington, 1989-2014. Minimum protocol territories included 8-10 territories that we visited only once per year beginning in 2002. A territory was considered inhabited if a single owl response was detected which was not associated with a neighboring territory.



Figure 4. Number of vacant territories, hybrid territories, and number of territories inhabited by singles, pairs, and "additional owls" on the Cle Elum Study Area, Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, Washington, 1989-2014. An "additional owl" is counted when a single owl is detected at a territory where a pair or territorial owl has already been confirmed, and the single owl response cannot be attributed to an adjacent territory. A hybrid territory is one inhabited by a Spotted owl/Barred Owl pair or a Spotted Owl x Barred Owl hybrid. Totals do not include 8-10 vacant territories where we made less than 3 complete visits in a year starting in 2002.



Figure 5. Number of male and female Spotted Owls detected by year on the Cle Elum Study Area, Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, Washington, 1989-2014.

Elsewhere on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, we continued banding owls on a portion of what was the Wenatchee Demography Study Area (WEN, Figure 12). The WEN was monitored by National Council for Air and Stream Improvement from 1990-2003, in cooperation with the Wenatchee National Forest. We banded 8 new owls at 10 inhabited territories on the WEN, and changed bands or confirmed bands on 2 adult owls. We surveyed 47 territories to protocol.

Density Study Area

The DSA survey data indicate an overall decline in the number of owls detected in the DSA since 1991 (Figure 6).



Figure 6. Number of non-juvenile owls detected on the 204 km^2 Swauk Density Study Area on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, Washington, 1991-2014. Bars represent actual counts.

West Nile Virus

None of the oral swab or blood samples from owls in 2005 or 2006 tested positive for the presence of West Nile Virus. The impact of West Nile Virus on the Spotted Owl population on the Cle Elum Study Area remains unknown. Eight humans, 4 mammals, and 80 mosquitoes tested positive for WNV in Washington State in 2014 (WSDH 2014), thus the West Nile Virus threat is still present in Washington State.

Barred Owls and Spotted Owls

The range of the Barred Owl now overlaps the range of the Northern Spotted Owl, and the potential for the Barred Owl to negatively affect the Spotted Owl population has been a concern for many years (Taylor and Forsman 1976, Courtney et al. 2006). Kelly et al. (2003) found that apparent occupancy and reproduction of Spotted Owls were lower when Barred Owls were detected nearby, and recent analyses have documented competition between Barred Owls and Spotted Owls (Dugger et al. 2011, Wiens et al. 2014). Thus, monitoring the number of inhabited Barred Owl territories is an important index to measure the effect of Barred Owls on Spotted Owl population trends (Olson et al. 2005)

Barred Owl (*Strix varia*) (photo by Steve Sleep)

General Study Area

We recorded 46 Barred Owl responses in the GSA in 2014 during our Spotted Owl surveys. Based on how these responses were situated temporally and/or geographically, we believe the responses represent 35 Barred Owl territories. Due to limited resources, we did not attempt to determine whether the responses represented nesting pairs.

During the 2014 meta-analysis, we developed a study-area specific Barred Owl covariate for use in estimating survival and population growth rate of Spotted Owls. We generated Theissen polygons from Spotted Owl territory centers, overlaid Barred Owl responses on these polygons, and calculated the proportion of the Spotted Owl territory centers which were inhabited by Barred Owls. While the proportion of Spotted Owl territories with Barred Owl responses has increased on the Cle Elum Study Area (Figure 7), the increase is not as sharp as in other study areas within the range of the Spotted Owl.



Figure 7. Proportion of 94 Spotted Owl territories with a Barred Owl response, Cle Elum Study Area, Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, Washington, 1989-2014.

Density Study Area

By completely surveying the Density Study Area each year, we were able to estimate which portions of the DSA were inhabited by Barred Owls and which portions were inhabited by Spotted Owls. The apparent number of inhabited Barred Owl territories in the DSA increased in 1991-2000 (Figure 8), outnumbering inhabited Spotted Owl territories in several years. Since 2000, the number of inhabited Barred Owl territories has varied among years. This year, we found fewer Barred Owls than in 2012-2013, however Barred Owls territories still outnumbered Spotted Owl territories (Figure 8).



Figure 8. Number of territories in which we detected Spotted Owls and Barred Owls in the Swauk Cr. Density Study Area, Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, Washington, 1991-2014.Territories were considered inhabited if an owl of either sex was detected at the territory. The values for Barred Owls in 2009 include one territory inhabited by a Spotted owl/Barred Owl pair.

"Sparred" owl (Spotted owl x Barred Owl hybrid) fledgeling, 22 July, 2009

Hybrids

Although we have detected Barred Owls on the General Study Area since 1989, we documented our first case of a Spotted owl/Barred Owl pair in 2009. The pair included a male Spotted owl and a female Barred Owl—the most common pair formation when Spotted Owls and Barred Owls hybridize (Haig et al. 2004, Kelly et al. 2004). The pair nested and produced 2 young. We found one of the hybrid offspring (a male) from this pair on our study area in 2011. This owl dispersed about 44 km. This year, we detected a hybrid Spotted x Barred male at night but were unable to determine if it was from the 2009 hybrid pair.

Barred Owl Removal

In September, 2013, the US Fish and Wildlife Service published its Record of Decision to begin a Barred Owl removal study (USFWS 2013). This study will evaluate the effect of Barred Owl removal on vital rates (e.g. survival, reproduction, recruitment) of the Spotted Owl. The USFWS chose the Cle Elum Study Area as 1 of 4 study areas in the range of the owl to participate in the removal study. The USFWS will begin surveying for Barred Owls in spring, 2015 in preparation for Barred Owl removal in the fall.

Reproductive Rates

Four of the 5 females for which we determined nesting status in 2014 nested. We found young at an additional territory after the incubation and rearing period. Of these 5 nesting females, all produced young. Average number of young fledged was 1.66 (SE = 0.42, Table 3). We documented 1 nest that fledged 3 young, which inflated the average estimate of number of young fledged for this year since we counted the number of young produced for so few (6) females. We have not found a nest that fledged 3 young since 2003. The 2014 values for proportion of females nesting and number of young fledged were above the average for all years (Figure 9, Table 3).

The pronounced odd-even year pattern of nesting and number of young fledged seen in 1989-1999—a pattern that was evident in many studies throughout the range of the Spotted Owl--has waned somewhat in the last 12 years (Figure 9, Table 3).

Forsman et al. (2011) found that models that included a time trend covariate were among the competing models for fecundity (number of young produced * 0.5) on the Cle Elum Study area. The 95% confidence intervals around the negative beta estimate (-0.005) for trend in fecundity barely overlapped zero (-0.017 – 0.006, Forsman et al. 2011:25). Thus, these estimates provide suggestive evidence that fecundity has declined over time on this study area.



Figure 9. Reproductive indices of Northern Spotted Owls on the Cle Elum Study Area, Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, Washington, 1989-2014. Indices shown are: *proportion of females nesting* and *number of young fledged*. The solid and dotted lines show the average (all years 1989-2014) number of young fledged and proportion nesting, respectively.

While the reproductive rates appear to have been somewhat less variable in recent years, these reproductive indices are estimated from a declining pool of reproductive owls. Thus, the reproductive potential of the Spotted Owl population on the Cle Elum Study Area has declined over time. At the current population size, the total number of young produced in an above-average reproductive year (e.g. 2014) is only slightly greater than the worst reproductive years when the population was much larger (e.g. 1993, 1997, Figure 10). The small number of reproductive females remaining on the study area is clearly a cause for concern should this situation persist, given recent analyses that suggest there is a genetic bottleneck in this region (Funk et al. 2009). Additionally, small populations can have a depressed capacity to withstand environmental variation (Soule and Mills' 1998).



Figure 10. Hypothesized annual female reproductive output (average yearly number of young fledged * number of females detected each year), Cle Elum Study Area, Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, Washington, 1989-2014. Note in the years prior to 1992 the sample of females monitored each year was increasing as we added new territories to the sample. Data points with red circles are years with above average number of young fledged.

Western Spruce Budworm

An outbreak of the western spruce budworm (*Choristoneura occidentalis)* began on the Cle Elum Study Area in 2001. Aerial detection surveys by Washington Department of Natural Resources have recorded heavy spruce budworm damage on as much as 24% of the GSA in at least 1 year in 2001-2013 (WDNR 2014). The mean percentage of owl core areas recorded with heavy budworm defoliation was 33% (SE= 2.9, range 0 - 99%). Defoliation by the budworm could reduce Spotted Owl habitat quality by decreasing canopy closure and affecting recruitment of younger trees, particularly in stands that are dominated by Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menzesii*) and grand fir (*Abies grandis*. Currently, the effect of budworm defoliation on owl habitat quality is highly variable among owl core areas depending on the degree and duration of budworm defoliation, and the species and age composition of the stands. Yearly defoliation was less noticeable in 2013-2014, and aerial surveys in 2013 recorded less area as heavily damaged by spruce budworm compared to previous years (Figure 11). Thus, the spruce budworm outbreak may be subsiding.



Figure 11. Areas heavily defoliated by spruce budworm in the General Study Area, Cle Elum Spotted Owl Demography Study Area, Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, Washington, 2000 – 2013. The area mapped in red is the total area recorded by WDNR aerial detection surveys as heavily defoliated by spruce budworm in at least 1 year. The graph at lower left shows the area (ha) recorded as heavily defoliated by budworms by year.

The 2014 Spotted Owl Demographic Workshop

January 2014 marked the sixth in a series of workshops held at 5-year intervals to analyze data from Spotted Owl demography study areas. The results from the meta analysis will be published in a peer-reviewed journal. This analysis included data from the Cle Elum Study Area 1989-2013, as well as 7 other Spotted Owl demography study areas funded under the Northwest Forest Plan (Figure 12). Three additional study areas also participated in the 2014 workshop.



Figure 12. Northern Spotted Owl Demography Study Areas in the range of the Owl in the USA. The Marin (CA), Warm Springs (OR), and Wenatchee (WA) study areas were discontinued after the 2003 analysis.

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED

We were unable to survey on 4 scheduled survey days and/or nights due to inclement weather, resulting in a loss of 7 person-days of survey. This is a relatively small number of survey days lost compared to most years.

Reduced maintenance and decommission of Forest Service roads continues to reduce vehicle access. This often necessitates other means of travel (e.g. foot, bicycle, ATV) to our calling stations, which often increases time spent for each survey.

As owl territories have become vacant, we have had to increase our number of nocturnal visits in order to achieve valid surveys. In addition, surveys done by cooperating organizations to monitor owl territories in our sample have largely ceased. The combination of these 2 developments has increased the overall workload for accomplishing this study. These difficulties are not likely to change in the near future.

LITERATURE CITED

Anthony, R. G., E. D. Forsman, A. B. Franklin, D. R. Anderson, K. P. Burnham, G. C. White, C. J. Schwarz, J. D. Nichols, J. E. Hines, G. S. Olson, S. H. Ackers, L. S. Andrews, B. L. Biswell, P. C. Carlson, L. V. Diller, K. M. Dugger, K. E. Fehring, T. L. Fleming, R. P. Gerhardt, S. A. Gremel, R. J. Gutiérrez, P. J. Happe, D. R. Herter, J. M. Higley, R. B. Horn, L. L. Irwin, P. J. Loschl, J. A. Reid, and S. G. Sovern. 2006. Status and trends in demography of northern Spotted owls, 1985-2003. Wildlife Monographs 163.

Collett, D. (1991), Modeling Binary Data, London: Chapman & Hall

Courtney, S. Pl, J A Blakesley, R E Bigley, M L Cody, J P Dumbacher, R C Fleischer, A B Franklin, J F Franklin, R J Gutiérrez, J M Marzluff, L Sztukowski. 2004. Scientific evaluation of the status of the Northern Spotted Owl. Sustainable Ecosystems Institute, Portland, Oregon.

Crozier, M. L., M. E. Seamans, R. J. Gutiérrez , P. J. Loschl, R. B. Horn, S. G. Sovern, and E. D. Forsman. Does the presence of Barred owls suppress the calling behavior of spotted owls? Condor 108:760-769.

Dugger, K. M., R. G. Anthony, and L. S. Andrews. 2011. Transient dynamics of invasive competition: Barred Owls, Spotted Owls, habitat, and the demons of competition present. Ecological Applications 21:2459-2468.

Forsman, E. D. 1983. Methods and materials for locating and studying Spotted Owls. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-162. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. 8 pp.

Forsman, E. D., DeStefano, S., Raphael, M. G., and Gutiérrez, R. J., Eds. 1996. Demography of the northern Spotted Owl. Studies in Avian Biology 17. 122 pp.

Forsman, E.D., R. G. Anthony, K. M. Dugger, E. M. Glenn, A.B. Franklin, G.C. White, C. J. Schwarz, K. P. Burnham, D. R. Anderson, J. D. Nichols, J. E. Hines, J. B. Lint, R.J. Davis, S. H. Ackers, L. S. Andrews, B.L. Biswell, P. C. Carlson, L. V. Diller, S. A.Gremel, D. R. Herter, J.M. Higley, R. B. Horn, J.A. Reid, J. Rockweit, J. P. Schaberl, T.J. Snetsinger, and S.G. Sovern. 2011. Population demography of northern spotted owls. Studies in Avian Biology 40.

Franklin, A. B., D. R. Anderson, E. D. Forsman, K. P. Burnham and F. W. Wagner. 1996. Methods for collecting and analyzing demographic data on the Northern Spotted Owl. Studies in Avian Biology 17:12-20.

Franklin, A. B., Burnham, K. P., White, G. C., Anthony, R. G., Forsman, E. D., Schwartz, C., Nichols, J. D., and Hines, J. 1999. Range-wide status and trends in northern Spotted Owl populations. Unpublished report. 71 pp.

Funk, W. C., E. D. Forsman, M. Johnson, T. D. Mullins, and S. M. Haig. 2009. Evidence for recent population bottlenecks in northern spotted owls (Strix occidentalis caurina). Conservation Genetics DOI 10.1007/s10592-009-9946-5.

Haig, S. M., T. D. Mullins, E. D. Forsman, P. W. Trail, and L. Wennerberg. 2004. Genetic identification of Spotted Owls, Barred Owls, and their hybrids: legal implications of hybrid identity. Conservation Biology 18: 1347-1357.

Kelly, E. G., E. D. Forsman, and R. G. Anthony. 2003. Are Barred Owls displacing Spotted Owls? Condor 105:45-53.

Kelly, E. G., and E. D. Forsman. 2004. Recent records of hybridization between Barred Owls (*Strix varia*) and Northern Spotted Owls (*S. occidentalis caurina*). Auk 121:806-810.

Lint, J., Noon, B., Anthony, R., Forsman, E., Raphael, M., Collopy, M., and Starkey, E. 1999. Northern Spotted Owl effectiveness monitoring plan for the Northwest Forest Plan. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-440. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. 43p.

MacKenzie, D. I., J. D. Nichols, G. B. Lachman, S. Droege, J. A. Royle, and C. A. Langtimm. 2002. Estimating site occupancy rates when detection probabilities are less than one. Ecology 83:2248–2255.

Olson, G. S., R. G. Anthony, E. D.Forsman, S. H. Ackers, P. J. Loschl, J. A. Reid, K. M. Dugger, E. M. Glenn, W. J. Ripple. 2005. Modeling of site occupancy dynamics for Northern Spotted Owls, with emphasis on the effects of Barred Owls. Journal of Wildlife Management 69:918-932.

Olson, G. S., E. D. Forsman, R. G. Anthony, S. G. Sovern, and B. Biswell. Northern Spotted Owl site occupancy in eastern Washington: the effects of Barred owls and landscape pattern. In prep.

Reid, J. R., R. B. Horn, and E. D. Forsman. 1999. Detection rates of Spotted Owls based on acoustic-lure and live-lure surveys. Wildl. Soc. Bull. 27:986-990.

Soule, M. E., and L. S. Mills. 1998. No need to isolate genetics. Science 282:1658-1659. doi: 10.1126/science.282.5394.1658

SAS Institute Inc. 2009. Cary, NC, USA.

Taylor, A. L., and E. D. Forsman. 1976. Recent range extensions of the Barred owl in western North America, including the first records for Oregon. Condor 78:560-561.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, and U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management [USDA and USDI]. 1994. Record of decision for amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management planning documents within the range of the northern spotted owl. 74pp.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2013. Experimental removal of barred owls to benefit threatened northern spotted owls; Record of decision for final environmental impact statement. Federal Register 78:57171-57173.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2011. Protocol for surveying proposed management activities that may impact spotted owls. USDI Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, OR. 38 pp.

Washington State Department of Health (WSDH). 2014. West Nile Virus surveillance maps and statistics. http://www.doh.wa.gov/

Washington State Department of Natural Resources (WDNR). 2014. GIS data center. http://fortress.wa.gov/dnr/app1/dataweb/dmmatrix.html.

Wiens, J. D., R. G. Anthony, and E. D. Forsman. 2014. Competitive interactions and resource partitioning between Northern Spotted Owls and Barred Owls in western Oregon. Wildlife Monographs 185. 50pp.

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS IN FISCAL YEAR 2014

Sovern, S. G., E. D. Forsman, K. M. Dugger, and M. Taylor. 2015. Roosting habitat use and selection by Northern Spotted Owls during natal dispersal. Journal of Wildlife Management 79:254-262.

Forsman, E. D., Sovern, S.G., M. Taylor, and B. L. Biswell. Home range and habitat selection by Northern Spotted Owls on the east slope of the Cascades Mountains, Washington. In review.

Sovern, S. G., E. D. Forsman, G. S. Olson, B. L. Biswell, M. Taylor, and R. G. Anthony. 2014. Barred Owls and landscape attributes Influence territory occupancy of Northern Spotted Owls. Journal of Wildlife Management 78:1436-1443.

Attended 2 field trips with the Teanaway Community Forest Advisory Committee to discuss spotted owl ecology in the Teanaway River drainage.

"Nature of Night" program, 22 November, 2014, Central Washington University Center for Excellence in Science and Mathematics Education. A poster presentation and owl pellet examples.

The Cle Elum Ranger District staff was given weekly updates of our owl surveys and information as needed in support of District projects.

Apppendix 1

Table 1. Number of Spotted owls banded each year on the Cle Elum Study Area, Okanogan-Wenatchee National forest, Washington, 1989-2014. Total for juveniles includes 2 hybrid Spotted x Barred Owl hybrids banded in 2009.

	Density Study Area					General Study Area					
Year	Adults	(M,F)	Subadults	(M,F)	Juveniles	Adults	(M,F)	Subadults	(M,F)	Juveniles	Total
1989	12	(7,5)	3	(1,2)	10	16	(10,6)	2	(0,2)	10	53
1990	5	(3,2)	2	(1,1)	12	38	(21,17)	4	(2,2)	28	89
1991	5	(4,1)	2	(2,0)	7	20	(11,9)	12	(3,9)	34	80
1992	0	(0,0)	2	(1,1)	16	16	(7,9)	2	(0,2)	60	96
1993	1	(0,1)	1	(1,0)	2	7	(1,6)	4	(1,3)	8	23
1994	0	(0,0)	1	(1,0)	14	4	(2,2)	2	(1,1)	52	73
1995	0	(0,0)	2	(2,0)	8	4	(3,1)	2	(2,0)	23	39
1996	0	(0,0)	1	(0,1)	12	2	(0,2)	0	(0,0)	39	54
1997	0	(0,0)	0	(0,0)	0	4	(2,2)	3	(2,1)	3	10
1998	0	(0,0)	1	(0,1)	9	2	(1,1)	2	(1,1)	43	57
1999	0	(0,0)	1	(0,1)	7	1	(0,1)	1	(1,0)	8	18
2000	0	(0,0)	2	(2,0)	11	1	(1,0)	3	(0,3)	18	35
2001	1	(1,0)	0	(0,0)	9	2	(1,1)	0	(0,0)	15	27
2002	0	(0,0)	0	(0,0)	5	1	(1,0)	1	(1,0)	11	18
2003	0	(0,0)	1	(1,0)	13	5	(3,2)	1	(1,0)	16	36
2004	0	(0,0)	1	(1,0)	5	2	(0,2)	1	(0,1)	14	23
2005	0	(0,0)	0	(0,0)	7	1	(0,1)	1	(1,0)	11	20
2006	0	(0,0)	1	(1,0)	5	1	(0,1)	0	(0,0)	11	18
2007	1	(1,0)	2	(1,1)	3	3	(3,0)	2	(1,1)	11	22
2008	0	(0,0)	1	(0,1)	3	0	(0,0)	0	(0,0)	6	10
2009	0	(0,0)	0	(0,0)	4	3	(1,2)	1	(1,0)	9	17
2010	0	(0,0)	0	(0,0)	2	0	(0,0)	0	(0,0)	9	11
2011	0	(0,0)	0	(0,0)	2	0	(0,0)	1	(0,1)	7	10
2012	0	(0,0)	0	(0,0)	2	0	(0,0)	0	(0,0)	5	7
2013	0	(0,0)	0	(0,0)	2	1	(1,0)	0	(0,0)	1	4
2014	1	(1,0)	0	(0,0)	0	1	(0,1)	0	(0,0)	5	7
Total	26	(17,9)	24	(15,9)	170	135	(69,66)	45	(18,27)	457	857

Table 2. Survey effort for the Cle Elum Study Area, Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, Washington, 1989-2014.

	territories surveyed to minimum protocol [1]	territories surveyed to protocol [2]	new territories added	total owls detected	territories inhabited [3]	hybrid territories [4]
1989	0	19	19	36	19	0
1990	0	46	27	83	43	0
1991	0	71	27	109	59	0
1992	0	82	10	120	64	0
1993	0	80	3	101	54	0
1994	0	87	3	99	53	0
1995	0	86	1	93	51	0
1996	0	81	1	82	46	0
1997	0	86	1	68	40	0
1998	0	87	0	78	44	0
1999	0	82	1	76	45	0
2000	0	82	1	68	39	0
2001	0	80	0	56	33	0
2002	8	75	0	44	26	0
2003	10	75	2	50	28	0
2004	8	77	0	49	26	0
2005	8	77	0	46	26	0
2006	8	77	0	46	29	0
2007	8	77	0	40	23	0
2008	8	75	0	36	26	0
2009	8	75	0	31	22	1
2010	8	75	0	26	18	0
2011	8	75	0	21	11	1
2012	8	75	0	20	13	0
2013	8	75	0	21	14	0
2014	8	75	0	18	11	1

[1] Minimum protocol consisted of one visit to the territory.
[2] Territories surveyed to protocol as outlined in Lint et al. (1999).
[3] A territory was considered inhabited if one owl was detected during the survey period, March-August.
[4] Hybrid territories are those inhabited by a pair composed of a Spotted and a Barred Owl or by a Spotted Owl/Barred Owl hybrid.

Table 3. Reproductive indices of Spotted owls on the Cle Elum Study Area, Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, Washington, 1989-2014. Number of young fledged and mean brood size of successful nests.

	Number of young fledged			Mean brood size of successful nests		
Year	**N[1]**	**Mean**	**SE**	**N[2]**	**Mean**	**SE**
1989	11	1.55	0.25	9	1.89	0.11
1990	31	1.32	0.16	23	1.78	0.09
1991	46	0.89	0.14	24	1.71	0.11
1992	50	1.58	0.12	42	1.88	0.09
1993	43	0.23	0.09	6	1.67	0.21
1994	40	1.48	0.19	27	2.19	0.13
1995	38	0.84	0.14	20	1.60	0.11
1996	33	1.52	0.14	28	1.79	0.09
1997	33	0.12	0.07	3	1.33	0.33
1998	36	1.44	0.17	27	1.93	0.13
1999	27	0.59	0.16	10	1.60	0.16
2000	31	1.03	0.16	20	1.60	0.11
2001	26	1.00	0.18	16	1.63	0.13
2002	19	0.84	0.22	9	1.78	0.15
2003	22	1.32	0.20	16	1.81	0.14
2004	23	0.96	0.19	13	1.69	0.13
2005	20	1.00	0.22	11	1.82	0.12
2006	15	1.13	0.24	10	1.70	0.15
2007	16	0.94	0.23	9	1.67	0.17
2008	9	0.78	0.32	4	1.75	0.25
2009	10	1.10	0.31	6	1.83	0.17
2010	7	1.71	0.29	6	2.00	0.00
2011	10	1.10	0.31	6	1.83	0.17
2012	6	1.17	0.31	5	1.40	0.24
2013	7	0.71	0.36	3	1.67	0.33
2014	6	1.67	0.42	5	2	0.32
Total	615	1.04	0.04	358	1.79	0.29

[1] Sample size (n) includes those females checked for reproductive status by August 31. Fecundity is the number of females fledged per female, assuming a 50:50 sex ratio. Values have changed from previous versions due to ignoring owls wearing tailmount transmitters.

[2] Mean brood size of nests that produced at least 1 young, and where the number of fledged young was determined by August 31. Values have changed from previous versions due to ignoring owls wearing tailmount transmiters.

Table 3 (cont). Reproductive indices of Spotted owls on the Cle Elum Study Area, Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, Washington, 1989-2014. Proportion of females that nested.

Year	N[1]	Proportion	95% CI[4]	
1989	8	0.88	0.47	1.00
1990	21	0.86	0.64	0.97
1991	33	0.64	0.45	0.80
1992	47	1.00	0.92	1.00
1993	39	0.18	0.08	0.34
1994	34	0.91	0.76	0.98
1995	32	0.66	0.47	0.81
1996	32	0.97	0.84	1.00
1997	27	0.15	0.04	0.34
1998	34	0.91	0.76	0.98
1999	20	0.60	0.36	0.81
2000	27	0.81	0.62	0.94
2001	23	0.74	0.52	0.90
2002	17	0.59	0.33	0.82
2003	20	0.95	0.75	1.00
2004	20	0.75	0.51	0.91
2005	19	0.58	0.33	0.80
2006	13	0.92	0.64	1.00
2007	15	0.67	0.38	0.88
2008	5	0.80	0.28	0.99
2009	6	0.83	0.36	1.00
2010	5	1.00	0.48	1.00
2011	5	0.80	0.28	0.99
2012	4	1.00	0.40	1.00
2013	5	0.60	0.15	0.95
2014	5	0.80	0.28	0.99
Total	516	0.73	0.69	0.76

[1] Sample size (n) includes females that were checked for nesting status before June 15.
[2] Sample size (n) includes nesting females that were checked for reproductive status by August 31.
[3] Sample size (n) includes all females that were checked for reproductive status by August 31. The sample size for this index is commonly larger than other indices because we often cannot make the required visits to determine nesting status before the June15 cutoff due to limited access or low response rates for non-nesting females.
[4] Exact confidence limits for the binomial proportion using the F distribution, Collett (1991).
Values are different than previous annual reports due to excluding owls with tailmount radio-transmitters in these estimates.

Table 3 (cont). Reproductive indices of Spotted owls on the Cle Elum Study Area, Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, Washington, 1989-2014. Proportion of nesting females fledging young.

Year	N[2]	Proportion	95% CI[4]	
1989	7	1.00	0.59	1.00
1990	17	0.94	0.71	1.00
1991	21	0.81	0.58	0.95
1992	44	0.86	0.73	0.95
1993	7	0.86	0.42	1.00
1994	31	0.77	0.59	0.90
1995	21	0.90	0.70	0.99
1996	31	0.90	0.74	0.98
1997	4	0.75	0.19	0.99
1998	31	0.84	0.66	0.95
1999	12	0.75	0.43	0.95
2000	22	0.91	0.71	0.99
2001	17	0.82	0.57	0.96
2002	10	0.80	0.44	0.97
2003	18	0.78	0.52	0.94
2004	15	0.80	0.52	0.96
2005	11	0.91	0.59	1.00
2006	12	0.67	0.35	0.90
2007	10	0.90	0.55	1.00
2008	4	0.75	0.19	0.99
2009	5	1.00	0.48	1.00
2010	5	0.80	0.28	0.99
2011	4	0.75	0.19	0.99
2012	4	1.00	0.40	1.00
2013	3	0.67	0.09	0.99
2014	4	1.00	0.40	1.00
Total	370	0.85	0.81	0.88

[1] Sample size (n) includes females that were checked for nesting status before June 15.
[2] Sample size (n) includes nesting females that were checked for reproductive status by August 31.
[3] Sample size (n) includes all females that were checked for reproductive status by August 31. The sample size for this index is commonly larger than other indices because we often cannot make the required visits to determine nesting status before the June15 cutoff due to limited access or low response rates for non-nesting females.
[4] Exact confidence limits for the binomial proportion using the F distribution, Collett (1991).
Values are different than previous annual reports due to excluding owls with tailmount radio-transmitters in these estimates.

Table 3 (cont). Reproductive indices of Spotted owls on the Cle Elum Study Area, Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, Washington, 1989-2014. Proportion of females fledging young.

Year	N[3]	Proportion	95% CI[4]	
1989	11	0.82	0.48	0.98
1990	31	0.74	0.55	0.88
1991	46	0.52	0.37	0.67
1992	50	0.84	0.71	0.93
1993	43	0.14	0.05	0.28
1994	40	0.68	0.51	0.81
1995	38	0.53	0.36	0.69
1996	33	0.85	0.68	0.95
1997	33	0.09	0.02	0.24
1998	36	0.75	0.58	0.88
1999	27	0.37	0.19	0.58
2000	31	0.65	0.45	0.81
2001	26	0.62	0.41	0.80
2002	19	0.47	0.24	0.71
2003	22	0.73	0.50	0.89
2004	23	0.57	0.34	0.77
2005	20	0.55	0.32	0.77
2006	15	0.67	0.38	0.88
2007	16	0.56	0.30	0.80
2008	9	0.44	0.14	0.79
2009	10	0.60	0.26	0.88
2010	7	0.86	0.42	1.00
2011	10	0.60	0.26	0.88
2012	6	0.83	0.36	1.00
2013	7	0.43	0.10	0.82
2014	6	0.83	0.36	0.99
Total	615	0.58	0.54	0.62

[1] Sample size (n) includes females that were checked for nesting status before June 15.
[2] Sample size (n) includes nesting females that were checked for reproductive status by August 31.
[3] Sample size (n) includes all females that were checked for reproductive status by August 31. The sample size for this index is commonly larger than other indices because we often cannot make the required visits to determine nesting status before the June15 cutoff due to limited access or low response rates for non-nesting females.
[4] Exact confidence limits for the binomial proportion using the F distribution, Collett (1991).
Values are different than previous annual reports due to excluding owls with tailmount radio-transmitters in these estimates.