

SPOTTED OWL MONITORING IN OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK: 2015 ANNUAL REPORT



Prepared by Scott Gremel
Olympic National Park
600 East Park Avenue
Port Angeles, WA 98362
Scott_Gremel@nps.gov

This document is a preliminary summary of data from the 2015 field season and should not be copied or cited without permission.

Cover Photograph: Male spotted owl from La Poel Creek, near Lake Crescent. Photo by Erin Hennessey, NPS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	2
2015 RESULTS.....	3
General Monitoring and Site Status	3
Nest and Reproductive Monitoring	6
Banding and Capture	7
Juvenile Dispersal	7
Barred Owls	7
Field Recorders	9
Other Species	10
DISCUSSION	10
COOPERATIVE EFFORTS	11
2009/2014 Spotted Owl Demography Workshops	11
Northern Spotted Owl Presence/Absence Monitoring	12
Other Interagency Activities and Outreach.....	12
BUDGET	12
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	12
LITERATURE CITED	13
APPENDIX 1- Nest Success	15
APPENDIX 2- IBP Owl Survey Results.....	16

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes progress on the northern spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*) monitoring program in Olympic National Park (ONP) in 2015. Monitored spotted owl territories in the national park, together with those visited by U.S. Forest Service Pacific Northwest Research Station in the surrounding Olympic National Forest, make up the Olympic Peninsula Demographic Study Area. This is one of eight study areas called for in the Northwest Forest Plan to estimate spotted owl population trends and monitor the effectiveness of the plan. Spotted owl territories in the NPS portion of the study have now been monitored an average of over 23 years.

In 2015, National Park Service personnel monitored a sample of 52 spotted owl territories (hereafter “sites”) to estimate rates of occupancy, survival and reproduction. Crews made 215 visits to these sites, detecting spotted owl pairs at three and single spotted owls at three. This was the lowest number of spotted owl responses in any year of this study. At the six sites where spotted owls responded, they were found on an average of 57% of monitoring visits. We documented no nest attempts or reproduction by spotted owls, which has been typical following years of widespread nesting in the Olympics. ONP crews banded two spotted owls, and resighted six previously banded spotted owls.

Data collected on eleven northern spotted owl demography studies 1990-2008 were analyzed at a workshop in Corvallis, OR in January of 2009. This analysis estimated a range-wide rate of population decline of 2.9% a year, and a 4.3% annual decline for the Olympic Peninsula. Female fecundity appeared stable in the Olympics, but the more important estimate of adult survival was declining here and on nine of 10 other areas studied. Results have not been released from most recent meta-analysis of spotted owl data, held in January of 2014.

Barred owls (*Strix varia*) were first documented on the Olympic Peninsula in 1985, and have now been detected within 800 meters of 94% of the monitored spotted owl sites in ONP. Competition with this species is now the primary threat to the conservation of spotted owls in protected areas. Occupancy rates of spotted owls in ONP declined significantly following the first detection of barred owls at a site. Spotted owls that persisted on territories following detections of barred owls both moved farther and increased in elevation relative to sites where barred owls were absent. Although barred owls now occupy portions of nearly all spotted owl territories in this study, most remaining spotted owls are found greater than 800 meters from any previous barred owl detection. So while spotted owls initially showed some ability to move within their territories to avoid barred owl competition, barred owls occupy new portions of spotted owl sites each year and the area available to spotted owls continues to be reduced. Models suggest that barred owls are less likely to occupy spotted owl sites on the steepest, driest slopes, and the movement of spotted owls to the steepest portions of their territories is making access and complete survey of the remaining activity centers more difficult.

INTRODUCTION

Olympic National Park (ONP) is located on the Olympic Peninsula in northwest Washington State. The park consists of 922,653 acres, of which roughly 756,000 acres are forested valleys naturally fragmented by high elevation peaks and ridges. Due to the lack of historic timber harvest or recent stand-replacing natural disturbance, most of the forested landscape is dominated by stands older than 100 years. There is a steep precipitation gradient from rainforest valleys in the southwest to rainshadow areas in the northeast, resulting in two very different habitat strata. Drier, east-side forests tend to be younger and dominated by Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*). West-side forests have a lower frequency of fire and contain more shade-tolerant species such as western red-cedar (*Thuja plicata*), western hemlock (*Tsuga heterophylla*), and Pacific silver fir (*Abies amabilis*), with varying amounts of Douglas-fir.

The Olympic Peninsula Demography Study is one of eight areas where demographic rates are monitored to assess the effectiveness of the Northwest Forest Plan in preventing a further decline in spotted owl populations. This area consists of 52 northern spotted owl (hereafter spotted owl) sites monitored by National Park Service crews in Olympic National Park and 45 sites monitored by U.S. Forest Service Pacific Northwest Research Station (PNW) crews in the surrounding Olympic National Forest. Each “site” is roughly equivalent to a spotted owl territory, and can have multiple activity centers occupied by spotted owls in different years up to 2 or more kilometers from the initial activity center. Site selection for the ONP portion of the study was not strictly random. Initially, all known sites were monitored. As additional sites were located in the course of surveying randomly located inventory plots, these were added to the sample if they were within a one day hike of a site already being monitored. Forty percent of the current sample of sites were monitored by 1990 and no sites were added or dropped after 1996. Funding and the logistics involved in monitoring sites as far as 24 miles from a trailhead determined the total number of sites that were feasible to monitor and we have continued to monitor sites regardless of their occupancy status.

This study area, including both Park and Forest Service managed lands, is generally representative of habitat conditions on federal lands on the Olympic Peninsula, although the proportion of suitable habitat in the study area is somewhat higher than outside, owing to the higher proportion of National Park land (Appendix F, Anthony et al., 2006). It is not representative of state, private and tribal lands on the Olympic Peninsula, where there is little suitable habitat and few or no remaining spotted owls.

This report summarizes results of fieldwork, cooperative efforts and administration of National Park Service run portion of Olympic Peninsula Demography Study during the 2015 breeding season. It is intended as a summary of results for administrators and cooperators, but does not present detailed methodologies or data analysis. In general, crews make daylong visits to historically occupied spotted owl territories calling for spotted owls. Spotted owls are color banded, and mark-recapture methods are used to calculate survival rates and

population trends based on resighting histories of these banded owls. Behavior of the owls when they are offered live mice allows the determination of nesting and reproductive status. More detailed methods are described in Franklin et al. (1996).

Reports from the Forest Service administered portion of the Olympic Spotted Owl Demography Study through 2014 are available at:
<http://www.reo.gov/monitoring/reports/northern-spotted-owl-reports-publications.shtml>

The specific objectives of this monitoring program are to:

- 1) Contribute to a range-wide assessment of spotted owl population trends, as required by the effectiveness monitoring component of the Northwest Forest Plan.
- 2) Monitor the effects of increasing barred owl populations on spotted owls.

2015 RESULTS

General Monitoring and Site Status

The project employed 10 full or part-time biological aids and technicians, and the project lead. ONP crews made 215 visits to 52 monitored spotted owl sites (site locations and occupancy status, Figure 1) and the mean number of visits per site was 4.1 (range 2-7). ONP crews also made four visits to two sites near the park boundary that are monitored by PNW, and six visits to three sites in ONP that are not part of the monitoring program. Except where specifically noted, the results in this report include only the 52 sites formally included in the ONP run portion of the demography study. Most visits (89%) were daytime searches where crews focused their efforts on recently occupied activity centers, covering suitable habitat out to 2 km as time permitted. The remaining visits were night or twilight surveys from roads or trails. The full field crew (4 one or two-person teams) visited owl sites between March 24 and July 7. Two additional visits were completed after this date.

The winter snowpack was extraordinarily low in the Olympic Mountains. The April 1 snow water equivalent was estimated at 2% of average, and there was little additional spring snow accumulation (USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service, Snow Course and SNOTEL data). Both winter and field season temperatures were 2-3 degrees F above average. Winter precipitation was close to average, but the field season was markedly drier, averaging under 50% of normal (National Weather Service, Elwha Ranger Station Co-op weather station data). Precipitation was recorded on 22% of site visits in the form of snow (4%) and rain or drizzle (18%). With no snowpack at the elevations of our spotted owl sites and no new access problems, we completed at least one visit to all of the monitored sites before May 15, the end of the nesting season.




Figure 1. Location and occupancy status of 52 monitored spotted owl territories in Olympic National Park, 2015. Black circles are spotted owl pairs, half-filled circles are single owls and white circles are monitored sites with no response. Shaded area within the park boundary is high elevation non-habitat.

We detected nine spotted owls this season: three pairs and three single males. Of the eight spotted owls identified to age class, one was a first year subadult and seven were adults three years of age or older. The six sites with spotted owl detections was the lowest proportion of sites with confirmed occupancy in any year of monitoring (Figure 2). Over the five year period from 2011-2015 there has been no occupancy by spotted owl pairs or resident singles at 35 of the sites monitored. The per visit detection rate at sites where spotted owls were found this year was 57%, which is a close to the 20 year average of 61%.




Figure 2. Percent of monitored spotted owl sites with 0, 1, or 2 adult owls detected, Olympic National Park, 1992-2015.

The 52 spotted owl sites monitored in 2015 represented a sample of roughly 23% of the 229 spotted owl territories estimated to occur in ONP as of 1995 (Seaman et al., 1996). The mean length of record is now 23.4 years (range 20-24), not including years prior to 1992 when monitoring to current protocols began at most sites.

Since 1994, the mean elevation of occupied spotted owl activity centers has increased 781' to 2906' and the mean slope within 200 meters has increased from 24° to 31° (when calculated on the 49 sites monitored in both 1994 and 2015). These changes result from both declining occupancy at sites that are lower in elevation and less steep, and the movement of spotted owls to the steeper and higher elevation areas within monitored sites. While there is clearly a relationship between elevation and the likelihood that a spotted owl site has remained occupied, models indicate that slope and topographic moisture explain more of the variance in occupancy than elevation alone (Gremel, 2005). It is likely that these topographic variables are simply correlates for barred owl occupancy (see later section). Regardless of the factors responsible, spotted owl distribution in the Olympics has changed dramatically over the course of this study. This has implications for both conservation efforts and our ability to monitor spotted owl sites safely and effectively.

Nest and Reproductive Monitoring

Spotted owl productivity (fecundity) is calculated as the number of female young produced per territorial female, assuming a 50:50 sex ratio of offspring. The fecundity rate in 2015 was zero. Two of the three females found this year were confirmed to be non-nesting, and the third was found later in the season and determined to be without young. Spotted owl fecundity in the Olympics has been highly variable, with years of high productivity often followed by a year with few or no nesting attempts (Figure 3). We documented no successful reproduction in nine of the last 24 years. The high year-to-year variation in female fecundity has been driven by the proportion of the population attempting to nest, and to a lesser extent




Figure 3. Olympic Peninsula adult spotted owl fecundity (mean # of female offspring/territorial female), 1992-2015. Includes both National Park (white bars) and National Forest (black bars). There was no reproduction on either ownership in 2015.

the productivity of those nests, rather than the rate of nest success which has averaged 91% (Appendix 1). The mean annual fecundity rate for adult female spotted owls in ONP ($N = 24$ years) was 0.33 (SE 0.066), and the estimate over the range of the northern spotted owl was 0.33 (SE 0.025) (Forsman, et al., 2011). It is important to note that this estimate is the rate per adult female spotted owl, and is derived from a decreasing number of individuals. The actual number of juveniles produced in the study area in recent nesting years is much lower than it

was 1994-2004 when 30-40 juveniles fledged from monitored sites in average nesting seasons.

Banding and Capture

Banding owls is necessary to identify individuals and estimate survival rates. All captured owls are fitted with a unique U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service number band and a color band. Adult and sub-adult owls are marked with a color band unique to a 16-km radius from the capture site, which enables field crews to identify these individuals without recapturing them. Juveniles receive a standard color band, which is changed if these birds are re-captured as adults on a new territory. We use established capture techniques for spotted owls (Franklin et al., 1996), and emphasize owl safety during training.

ONP crews captured and banded two spotted owls in 2015: a first year sub-adult and an adult. Of nine adult/subadult spotted owls detected at monitored sites, two were newly banded in 2015, six were “recaptures” based on sightings of marked owls from previous seasons and one was an unknown owl that could not be seen well enough to determine if it was banded. Since 1988, ONP crews have performed 551 captures and banded 401 spotted owls. We captured and banded under ONP master station banding permit 22633 and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 10(a)(1)(a) “take” permit TE842449-5.

Juvenile Dispersal

We recaptured one spotted owl originally banded as a juvenile in 2006. Twenty of the 171 spotted owls banded as juveniles by ONP crews prior to 2015 have been recaptured as adults or sub-adults on the Olympic Peninsula. Five dispersed to Olympic National Forest, the others were found within ONP. The median dispersal distance for this sample was 15.8 km (mean 18.9 km, SD 9.59, range 5.3- 41.8 km). The mean dispersal distance of females was 44% greater than that of males, but this difference was not statistically significant. The greater dispersal distance for females is consistent with results reported by Forsman et al. (2002) for a large sample of juveniles in Washington and Oregon. The mean age at recapture was 3.5 years, implying that most spotted owls spend several years as non-territorial "floaters" or on territories outside of our study sites before being detected. To date, we have documented no dispersal of spotted owls between the Olympic Peninsula and any of the study areas in the Washington Cascades.

Barred Owls

The first documented occurrence of barred owls on the Olympic Peninsula was on the west side of ONP in 1985 (Sharpe, 1989). This species now occurs across the entire range of the northern spotted owl and is considered to be the greatest threat to spotted owl conservation within protected reserves. Barred owls are dominant in competitive interactions with spotted

owls and evidence from many areas suggests that barred owls displace spotted owls from otherwise suitable habitat (Dark et al., 1998; Kelly, 2001; Gremel, 2005; Wiens, 2012). At ONP, rates of pair occupancy declined at spotted owl sites following the first barred owl detection there. At sites where spotted owls remained after barred owls were detected, they both moved farther from their original location and shifted to higher elevations, relative to spotted owl sites without barred owls (Gremel, 2005). While we record all encounters with barred owls in the course of spotted owl monitoring activities, we do not spend extensive time to establish whether a pair or single owl is present.

We recorded barred owls on 55 separate occasions representing an estimated 34 barred owl territories in 2015. We confirmed pairs at nine of these sites, either by direct observation or the presence of juveniles. Single barred owls were observed at 25 sites and a total of four juveniles were observed at two sites. While we do not specifically check for barred owl reproduction, an index of barred owl reproduction (the number of juveniles detected/occupied barred owl site) correlated significantly with annual rates of spotted owl fecundity from 1992-2006 at ONP (Spearman's $\rho = 0.726$, $p < 0.01$). We did no formal barred owl surveys this year, and data from field recordings (next section) are not yet available.

In 2015 we detected barred owls at 27 of 52 monitored spotted owl sites (Fig. 5). Here we define a spotted owl site as the area within 800m of all activity centers occupied between 1990 and 2015. By including both current and former spotted owl activity centers at a site, this definition includes barred owls that may have displaced spotted owls from parts of their former territory. Because spotted owls generally move away from areas of barred owl activity, the most recent spotted owl locations rarely have barred owls nearby. Barred owls were detected for the first time at one site, and have now been detected at 49 spotted owl sites (94%) in at least one year of the study, and 43 spotted owl sites (83%) in the last three years.

Of the six spotted owl sites with known occupancy, one was located within 450 meters of a barred owl detected this year. At this site, a sub-adult male spotted owl was found on consecutive days, and a barred owl was found less than 600 meters away on multiple follow-up visits on which we could not relocate the spotted owl. Two spotted owl sites were within 750 meters of barred owls detected in previous years, and the remaining three spotted owl sites were greater than 1250 meters from any previous barred owl detection.

Hybridization between barred and spotted owls has been documented, but appears to be infrequent after the initial period of colonization (Hamer et al. 1994; Herter and Hicks, 2000; Kelly and Forsman, 2004). No hybrids were observed this season.




Figure 5. *Proportion of monitored spotted owl sites (N=52) with barred owls detected, Olympic N.P., 1992-2015. The solid line is the cumulative proportion of sites where barred owls have ever been detected, and the broken line is the proportion of sites where barred owls were detected in each year during spotted owl monitoring visits.*

Field Recorders

Since 2010 we have investigated the use of acoustic field recorders to augment the occupancy data derived from the demographic monitoring program. In 2010-2012 we experimented with the use of these recorders at sites with known occupancy by barred and spotted owls to get initial estimates of detection probabilities and develop sampling protocols. In 2013 and 2014 we implemented the protocols at 21 sites still known to be occupied by spotted owls in 2012. The goals of this acoustic monitoring were to: 1) estimate the probability of detecting spotted owls with field recorders at sites known to be occupied; and 2) track occupancy of both barred and spotted owls with multiple methods (demography site visits and acoustic monitoring) at sites that have recently been occupied by spotted owls. The sample unit was a four hour recording beginning either 10 minutes before sunset or ending ten minutes after sunrise, recorded in 1 channel at a sample rate of 16 khz. We visually browsed recordings in the program Raven with 8 minute page intervals, noting the presence of all owl species and marbled murrelets. Length of time recorders were left out was based on the logistics of

installing and removing the units during our demographic monitoring visits, but was generally a week or more.

In 2015, we continued acoustic monitoring at the 21 sites which were occupied in 2012, and initiated monitoring at a random sample of 21 sites. For the randomly selected sites, either one or two recorders were deployed simultaneously, depending on the spatial extent of past spotted owl locations. For sites occupied in 2012, a single recorder was deployed at the 2012 site center. Because of overlap between the two groups being monitored, there were a total of 49 recorder deployments at 29 sites. The total number of four-hour samples collected was 686 (mean 17.15 samples/deployment, range 15-26). With the exception of one sample that did not download properly and had to be repeated, there were no technical problems with the field recorders. Recordings are still being processed.

Other Species

In addition to barred and spotted owls, we also record incidental responses by northern goshawks (*Accipiter gentilis*) and great-horned owls (*Bubo virginianus*). The number of occupied goshawk sites encountered during owl monitoring has ranged from 0-6 per year. This year we encountered goshawks at four sites, including two pairs and two single birds. We did not detect any great-horned owls at spotted owl sites.

DISCUSSION

Since the beginning of the monitoring program in the early 1990's, the proportion of sites where we have detected spotted owls has declined steadily. As recently as 2012 we located at least one spotted owl at 44% of the sites we visited. However barred owls were occupying the historic activity centers at most of these sites, and the spotted owls were often found away from the core areas that they had used in the past. By 2015, we were unable to locate spotted owls at the majority of these sites. This year we detected spotted owls at only one site that was not known to be occupied in the last three years. With little evidence of unoccupied sites becoming recolonized, the pattern of spotted owl distribution in ONP has been occurrence at a shrinking set of sites, rather than infrequent detections at a larger number of sites over several years. This decline in the area where spotted owls occur continues, as barred owls are found in new parts of some territories each year.

All evidence points to barred owl competition as the cause of the decline in spotted owl numbers at ONP. Although our data on barred owls is imperfect, once we detect barred owls at a spotted owl activity center, the spotted owls rarely persist in that stand. While spotted owls can continue to occupy a territory after barred owls are found nearby, it is usually by shifting their activity center away from the barred owls. At most territories, there is now

simply little or no suitable habitat that is not already occupied by barred owls.

Besides the obvious conservation concerns, the occurrence of spotted owls at so few locations should lead to an re-evaluation of whether the current monitoring strategy is the appropriate one for a situation very different from twenty years ago. With no evidence of occupancy at nearly 90% of monitored sites, the goal of the majority of site visits is to confirm the absence of spotted owls, or the presence of barred owls, rather than to resight and band owls for the demography study. There may be more efficient ways to monitor spotted owl sites that have been unoccupied for many years than to continue to make three or more daylong visits each year. This could involve a reduced number of annual visits to these sites, or a hybrid approach using field recorders or more comprehensive surveys at longer intervals to monitor for re-occupancy. Reducing the amount of time spent documenting the absence of spotted owls would also allow us to have a smaller, more experienced crew that could focus more time on the sites that remain occupied.

COOPERATIVE EFFORTS

2009/2014 Spotted Owl Demography Workshops

We participated in a meta-analysis workshop held January 5-11, 2014 in Corvallis, OR. This was the fifth such analysis to examine data from the spotted owl demography studies being conducted across the range of the species, and it included five additional years of data (2009-2013) collected since the last workshop. Data from federal lands on the Olympic Peninsula (ONP and Olympic National Forest combined) were analyzed along with those from 10 other demographic studies to estimate age-specific rates of fecundity, survival and population trends across the range of the northern spotted owl. For the first time an occupancy analysis was also conducted, which will provide an alternate measure of population trends for both barred and spotted owls. The results from the workshop have not been released as of this writing.

Results from the previous workshop, held in January 2009, were published in 2011 (Forsman, et al., 2011). In this analysis, the rate of fecundity on the Olympic Demographic Study Area was stable and best explained by the tendency of spotted owls to reproduce in alternate years (even/odd year effect). Annual apparent survival of territorial females declined over time at Olympic, and at nine of the ten other studies, with declines most pronounced for many areas in recent years. The steepest declines in apparent survival were on the three studies in Washington State. Although varying by year, there was no time trend in annual spotted owl recapture probabilities on the Olympic area, which have generally ranged between 0.6-0.8.

Range-wide, the decline in numbers of territorial northern spotted owls was estimated to be 2.9% a year. Point estimates for all studies indicated declining populations, and there was evidence for a statistically significant population decline at seven of eleven studies, including Olympic. The estimated rate of decline on the Olympic demographic study was 4.3% a year. Overall, it appeared that spotted owl populations in Washington were faring worse than those in Oregon and California.

Northern Spotted Owl Presence/Absence Monitoring

Beginning in 2005, spotted owl surveys were implemented as part of a long-term landbird monitoring program in the three large national parks in Washington State: Olympic, North Cascades and Mount Rainier. Crews from The Institute for Bird Populations survey randomly located 1.8 km-long transects, using protocols developed for a spotted owl inventory conducted at ONP in the early 1990s. After conducting point counts for landbirds at stations along these transects, surveyors call for spotted owls at five stations located 400 meters apart. Stations are called for 10 minutes and all stations in forested habitat are called, regardless of elevation. These surveys are providing an inexpensive test of the feasibility and statistical power of implementing a larger scale presence/absence survey, either to complement or replace the current demographic monitoring program.

Overall response rates by spotted owls have been quite low (Appendix 2). Data from 2015 are not yet available but between 2005 and 2014, surveys in the three parks resulted in 7 detections of spotted owls and 36 detections of barred owls on 544 transects.

Other Interagency Activities and Outreach

- Provided records of all field visits to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife for a state-wide spotted owl database.

BUDGET

All funding was provided by the NPS through the Regional Ecosystem Office of the Northwest Forest Plan. Funding for spotted owl monitoring was provided at the level of \$151,345 in FY 2015. An additional \$5000.00 was provided to support NPS participation in northern spotted owl recovery planning and regional projects as needed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The project is only possible due to the hard work, skill and dedication of the field crew. Declining spotted owl numbers require an increasing number of daylong no response searches in roadless wilderness and often difficult weather conditions. E.R. Burke, S.A. Gremel, H.M. Hareza, E.B. Hennessey, A.R. Hokit, T.J. Kay, E.R. Kohler, P.M. Loafman, L.M. Platt, S.D.

Yates, and S.M. Yuncevich performed the fieldwork in 2015. Patti Happe, ONP Wildlife Branch Chief, provided overall project supervision and administration, T.J. Kay assisted with coordination and supervision of the field work, and R.A. Hoffman and K.F. Beirne provided GIS support. Liz Kelly of the USFWS generously provided the program used to map barred owl locations relative to spotted owl sites.

LITERATURE CITED

- Anthony, R.G., E.D. Forsman, A.B. Franklin, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, G.C. White, C.J. Schwartz, 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. Gutierrez, 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.
- 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. Schaberl, T. J. Snetsinger, and S. G. Sovern. 2011. Population Demography of Northern Spotted Owls. *Studies in Avian Biology* 40.
- Dark, S.J., R.J. Gutierrez, and G.I.J. Gould. 1998. The barred owl (*Strix varia*) invasion in California. *The Auk* 115(1):50-56.
- Forsman, E.D., R.G. Anthony, J.A. Reid, P.J. Loschl, S.G. Sovern, M. Taylor, B.L. Biswell, A. Ellingson, E.C. Meslow, G. S. Miller, K.A. Swindle, J.A. Thraikill, F.F. Wagner, and D.E. Seaman. 2002. Natal and breeding dispersal of northern spotted owls. *Wildl. Monog.* 149.
- Franklin, A.B., D.R. Anderson, E.D. Forsman, K.B. 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., K.P. Burnham, G.C. White, R.G. Anthony, E.D. Forsman, C. Schwarz, J.D. Nichols and J. Hines. 1999. Range-wide status and trends in northern spotted owl populations. Oregon Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR.
- Gremel, S.A. 2005. Factors controlling distribution and demography of northern spotted owls in a reserved landscape. MS thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

- Hamer, T.E., E.D. Forsman, A.D. Fuchs, and M.L. Walters. 1994. Hybridization between barred and spotted owls. *The Auk* 111(2):487-492.
- Herter, D.H. and L.L. Hicks. 2000. Barred owl and spotted owl populations and habitat in the central Cascade Range of Washington. *J. Raptor Res.* 34(4):279-286.
- Kelly, E.G. 2001. The range expansion of the Northern Barred Owl: An evaluation of the impact on Spotted Owls. MS Thesis, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR.
- Kelly, E.G. and E.D. Forsman. 2004. Recent records of hybridization between barred owls and northern spotted owls. *The Auk* 121(3):806-810.
- National Weather Service COOP Weather Station, Elwha Ranger Station, Washington (452548). Available at: <http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/summary/Climsmwa.html>. Accessed on Sept. 28, 2015.
- Seaman, D.E., S.A. Gremel, S.L. Roberts, and D.W. Smith. 1996. Spotted owl inventory-monitoring in Olympic National Park, final report. Unpubl. NPS report, 34 pp.
- Sharpe, D.U. 1989. Range extension of the barred owl in western Washington and first breeding record on the Olympic Peninsula. *J. Raptor. Res.* 23(4): 179-180.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service – Snow Course and SNOTEL Data. Available at: <http://www.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/basin.html> Accessed on Sept. 28, 2015.
- Wiens, J.D. 2012. Competitive interactions and resource partitioning between Northern Spotted Owls and Barred Owls in western Oregon. PhD dissertation, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR

APPENDIX 1- Nest Success

Nesting status and success rate of female spotted owls of all age classes, at monitored sites in Olympic National Park, 1992-2015.

	Non-nesting	Nesting	Unknown nest status	Total females	Proportion nest status known	Proportion females nesting	Nest success ¹
1992	1	15	7	23	0.70	0.94	0.93
1993	16		5	21	0.76	0	*
1994	3	24	7	34	0.79	0.89	0.92
1995	15		6	21	0.71	0	*
1996	5	28	3	36	0.92	0.85	0.92
1997	15	8	6	29	0.79	0.35	0.75
1998	1	24	5	30	0.83	0.96	0.91
1999	9		5	14	0.64	0	*
2000	17	10	4	31	0.87	0.37	0.56
2001	16	8	4	28	0.86	0.33	1.00
2002	3	27		30	1.00	0.90	0.92
2003	23		2	25	0.92	0	*
2004	2	21	4	27	0.85	0.91	0.95
2005	20	1	3	24	0.88	0.05	1.00
2006	1	16	2	19	0.89	0.94	0.94
2007	13		1	14	0.93	0	*
2008	1	16	2	19	0.89	0.94	0.94
2009	8		1	9	0.89	0	*
2010	4	14		18	1.00	0.78	0.93
2011	5		1	6	0.83	0	*
2012	2	7	2	11	0.82	0.78	1.00
2013	3		1	4	0.75	0	*
2014	1	4		5	1.00	0.80	1.00
2015	2		1	3	0.67	0	*
Total ²	186	223	72	481	0.84	0.45	0.91

¹ Proportion of nest attempts that result in at least one fledgling, calculated on nests with known outcomes

² Where totals are calculated on proportions, they are the unweighted averages of the annual means

APPENDIX 2- IBP Owl Survey Results

Results of presence/absence owl surveys performed by The Institute for Bird Populations' landbird monitoring crews. This includes barred and spotted owls detected at or associated with owl calling stations, as well as incidental detections outside of formal survey or while conducting point counts. Multiple owls at a point are recorded as a single detection.

Year	National Park	Transects Called	Stations Called	Barred Owl Detections			Spotted Owl Detections		
				At Stations	Between Stations	Incidental	At Stations	Between Stations	Incidental
2005	Mt. Rainier	9	40	0	1	0	0	0	0
	N. Cascades	11	53	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Olympic	8	34	0	0	0	0	0	1
2006	N. Cascades	12	57	1	1	0	1	0	0
	Olympic	10	44	3	0	0	1	0	0
2007	Mt. Rainier	19	114	0	1	1	0	0	0
	N. Cascades	22	104	2	1	2	0	0	0
	Olympic	21	95	0	0	0	0	0	0
2008	Mt. Rainier	20	94	1	1	0	0	0	0
	N. Cascades	20	96	3	0	0	0	0	0
	Olympic	21	95	0	0	3	1	1	0
2009	Mt. Rainier	16	69	1	0	0	0	0	0
	N. Cascades	23	97	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Olympic	22	91	2	0	2	1	0	1
2010	Mt. Rainier	17	74	1	0	0	0	0	0
	N. Cascades	19	80	1	0	0	0	0	0
	Olympic	22	95	0	0	1	1	0	0
2011	Mt. Rainier	12	50	1	1	1	0	0	0
	N. Cascades	21	101	2	0	1	0	0	0
	Olympic	20	93	0	0	4	0	0	0
2012	Mt. Rainier	20	99	1	0	0	0	0	0
	N. Cascades	24	114	4	0	3	0	0	0
	Olympic	24	114	0	0	2	0	0	0
2013	Mt. Rainier	19	85	1	0	0	0	0	0
	N. Cascades	23	104	0	0	6	0	0	0
	Olympic	24	116	1	0	0	1	0	0
2014	Mt. Rainier	19	87	1	1	2	0	0	0
	N. Cascades	23	114	0	0	1	0	0	0
	Olympic	23	108	3	0	2	0	0	0
Totals		544	2517	29	7	31	6	1	2