



---

---

# **Marbled Murrelet Inland Monitoring Annual Report 2013**

---

---

**February 1, 2014**



This page intentionally blank.

## **PROJECT SUMMARY**

**Project Title:** Marbled Murrelet Inland Monitoring

**Subject Area:** Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) monitoring

**Date initiated:** March 1999

**End Date:** Ongoing

**Project Managers:** Sal Chinnici, Forest Science Manager, HRC, Mark Freitas, Wildlife Biologist, HRC. Analysis by M.Z. Peery, Ph.D., Dept. of Forest and Wildlife Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

### **Executive Summary**

An objective of the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) inland effectiveness monitoring program is to determine whether the Marbled Murrelet Conservation Areas (MMCAs) continue to be used by marbled murrelets. In pursuit of this objective, marbled murrelet activity is monitored in select MMCAs and the neighboring Headwaters Forest Reserve and Humboldt Redwoods State Park (Reserves). Areas within the Reserves serve as controls to gauge any changes in the MMCAs. Since the inception of HCP monitoring (1999), occupied behaviors have been observed using audio-visual (AV) surveys in the MMCAs and Reserve stands. In 2013, AV surveyors conducted 136 surveys at 33 stations and observed occupied behaviors (below canopy flight or circling) in all monitored Reserves and all MMCAs, with the exception of the Shaw Gift MMCA.

Radar surveys track murrelets traveling to and from nesting areas within the MMCAs and Reserves. Radar counts are considered indices of the breeding population, because non-breeding murrelets do not fly inland. In 2013, 56 radar surveys were conducted at 14 sites. Preliminary analysis of the data indicates that after twelve years of monitoring, trends in radar counts of murrelets in the MMCAs and Reserves have differed during the study period, and there has been an increase in radar counts in the MMCAs but not in the Reserves since the 2002 baseline.

No changes in monitoring strategies or intensity are recommended at this time.

**Reviewed:**

**Director, Forest Science**

Original signed by: \_\_\_\_\_

**Mike Miles**

**Project Manager/ Primary Author**



\_\_\_\_\_  
**Sal Chinnici**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES ..... iv

LIST OF FIGURES ..... iv

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

METHODS ..... 2

    Background .....2

    2013 Survey Effort.....3

    Analyses of Survey Data.....5

RESULTS ..... 6

    Occupancy.....6

    Inland murrelet counts using radar: 2002-2013 .....7

    Audio-visual counts: 2000-2013 (exploratory).....7

DISCUSSION ..... 8

RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 11

LITERATURE CITED ..... 12

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Mean annual counts* of total detections at audio-visual survey stations from 2000-2013. ....	14
Table 2. Mean annual counts* of marbled murrelets at radar sites in the HCP Bioregion from 2002-2013. ....	15

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1(a). Location of all marbled murrelet stations surveyed for effectiveness monitoring in 2013: Bell-Lawrence MMCA. ....	17
Figure 1(b). Location of all marbled murrelet stations surveyed for effectiveness monitoring in 2013: Shaw Gift MMCA.....	18
Figure 1(c-1). Location of all marbled murrelet stations surveyed for effectiveness monitoring in 2013: Headwater Forest Reserve. ....	19
Figure 1(c-2). Location of all marbled murrelet stations surveyed for effectiveness monitoring in 2013: Headwater Forest Reserve. ....	20
Figure 1(d). Location of all marbled murrelet stations surveyed for effectiveness monitoring in 2013: Cooper Mill MMCA. ....	21
Figure 1(e). Location of all marbled murrelet stations surveyed for effectiveness monitoring in 2013: Allen Creek MMCA. ....	22
Figure 1(f). Location of all marbled murrelet stations surveyed for effectiveness monitoring in 2013: Humboldt Redwoods State Park. ....	23
Figure 2. Marbled Murrelet Conservation Areas in southern Humboldt County, CA, and location of radar sites surveyed for marbled murrelet effectiveness monitoring.....	24
Figure 3. a) Annual proportion of AV effectiveness monitoring stations with occupied behaviors from 2000 to 2013 in Reserves and MMCAs. b) Annual proportion of radar sites with observed circling behaviors from 2002 to 2013 in Reserves and MMCAs. ....	25
Figure 4. Estimated number of radar detected marbled murrelets per survey (annual means) and trend lines at survey sites in Reserves and MMCAs from 2002 to 2013 (excluding 2009). ....	26
Figure 5. Estimated number of audio-visual detections per survey (annual means) and trend lines for marbled murrelets in Reserves and MMCAs from 2000 to 2013. ....	26
Figure 6. Annual mean radar detections (95% CI) in Reserves 2002-2013 (excluding 2009). ....	27
Figure 7. Annual mean radar detections (95% CI) in MMCAs 2002-2013 (excluding 2009). ....	27
Figure 8. Annual mean audio-visual (AV) detections (95% CI) in Reserves 2000-2013. ....	28
Figure 9. Annual mean audio-visual (AV) detections (95% CI) in MMCAs 2000-2013. ....	28
Figure 10. Mean annual number of marbled murrelets at-sea in the HCP region from Trinidad to Shelter Cove (Zone 4, Stratum 2) 2000-2012. ....	29

---

**PROJECT REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST**

---

Mr. David Anthon  
Bureau of Land Management  
1695 Heindon Rd.  
Arcata, CA 95521

Ms. Susan Sniado  
CDFW  
610 2nd Street  
Eureka, CA 95501

Dr. Gary Falxa  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office  
1655 Heindon Rd.  
Arcata, CA 95521

Dr. Martin Raphael  
USFS Pacific Northwest Research  
Station  
3625 93<sup>rd</sup> Ave. SW  
Olympia, WA 98512

Mr. Jay Harris  
California State Parks  
North Coast Redwoods District  
P.O. Box 2006  
Eureka, CA 95502-2006

Dr. Steven Courtney  
WEST, Inc.  
830 S. Lincoln St.  
Arlington, VA 22204

---

This page intentionally blank.



## INTRODUCTION

Under the terms of the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Marbled Murrelet surveys are carried out to determine the effectiveness of management measures (HCP 6.1.3; PALCO 1999):

*The Company will implement the implementation and effectiveness monitoring program discussed in Section 6 on the covered lands. The goals will be as follows:*

- 1. Determine whether the HCP conservation strategies are implemented as written.*
- 2. Determine whether the conservation strategies are having the predicted impact and effect on Marbled Murrelets.*

*These two monitoring goals can be regarded as implementation (or compliance) monitoring and effectiveness monitoring, respectively. These goals follow from the recommendations of the USFWS (Recovery Plan) and mirror similar efforts elsewhere in the region (e.g., Madsen et al. 1997, for federal lands).*

The overall goal of the monitoring surveys is to determine whether the MMCAs continue to be used by murrelets. In addition, the Reserves (Headwaters Forest Reserve [HFR] and Humboldt Redwoods State Park [HRSP]) are monitored for comparative purposes, essentially as controls. The HCP will be regarded as meeting conservation objectives if murrelets remain in occupancy of originally occupied sites, or any declines in occupancy occur at comparable rates in the MMCAs and Reserves (e.g., a change in occupancy rates due to a general population decline from oil spills or other stochastic events) (HCP section 6.1.3 pp. P-27 to P-31).

For effectiveness monitoring, audio-visual surveys were conducted to assess occupancy at the Reserves and MMCAs. In addition, radar surveys were conducted for comparing trends in murrelet counts between the Reserves and MMCAs.

### 2013 Objectives

- Complete all audio-visual and radar surveys.

- Determine current occupancy of MMCAs.
- If declines have occurred, are such declines at comparable rates in the MMCAs and the Reserves?

Appended to this 2013 report are several documents requested by reviewers in 2010 to aid in understanding objectives, methods, and results:

- Marbled Murrelet Scientific Review Panel notes and recommendations of April 5, 2004.
- 1998 Pacific Seabird Group (PSG) Marbled Murrelet Survey Protocol and recommendations (including 1994 through 1998 protocols and revisions).
- 2013 audio-visual and radar survey summaries including dates, times, and results.

## METHODS

### BACKGROUND

The HCP, section 6.1.3 “Monitoring” of the Marbled Murrelet Conservation Plan (section 6.1), states:

*The program will be overseen by PALCO’s existing Marbled Murrelet Scientific Review Panel (MMSRP). Members of the MMSRP will meet annually for the first five years of the plan to review monitoring program design and results and to make recommendations for future studies.*

The current monitoring program follows the MMSRP 2004 recommendations (MMSRP 2004).

- 1) Audio-visual surveys are conducted to assess occupancy at 33 stations (6 in the Reserves and 27 in the MMCAs) where each station is surveyed until an occupied behavior is observed or to a maximum of five times per season. Surveys are done according to the 1998 PSG protocol (HCP 6.1.3.3) and include circling behavior as a behavior indicative of occupancy. Inference is to the collection of stations, not to individual stations.
- 2) Radar surveys are used to track murrelet detections at 14 sites (6 in the Reserves and 8 in the MMCAs) where each site normally receives four visits per season and that radar

counts be treated as indices of abundance of murrelets flying into or through an MMCA or Reserve.

In 2006, the MMSRP made the following observations and recommendations regarding the analysis of the data collected during radar surveys:

- 1) There is good evidence that murrelet inland counts may be related to ocean conditions (e.g., Peery et al. 2004, Bigger et al. 2006a). Explore the relationship between ocean conditions (e.g., sea surface temperature (SST) and Northern Oscillation Index (NOI)) and annual trends in radar counts by using ocean conditions as a covariate in the analysis of the trend data.
- 2) There appears to be a relationship between the annual estimates of population size based on at-sea counts and inland radar counts. Explore the relationship between the at-sea population estimates and annual trends in radar counts by using the at-sea estimates as a covariate in the analysis of the trend data.

## **2013 SURVEY EFFORT**

As required by the HCP (6.1.3.3) and by agreement with the agencies, surveys were conducted at audio-visual monitoring stations in the Allen Creek MMCA ( $n = 11$ ), Bell Lawrence MMCA ( $n = 7$ ), Shaw Gift MMCA ( $n = 6$ ), Cooper Mill MMCA ( $n = 3$ ), with surveys conducted at stations in HFR ( $n = 3$ ) and HRSP ( $n = 3$ ) serving as controls. All audio-visual survey stations were located near, or in un-harvested and residual old growth habitat (Figure 1). Stations that were within 200 meters (m) of un-harvested old growth were classified as ‘old growth’ stations; all other stations were classified as ‘residual’ stations. Each station was visited until occupied behavior was observed or to a maximum of 5 visits. A total of 33 audio-visual survey stations were surveyed in 2013. All subsequent AV analyses in this report use data from surveys at these stations.

Surveyors conducted audio-visual surveys from 45 minutes prior to sunrise to 75 minutes after sunrise. The unit of measurement was a “detection”, which was defined as sighting or hearing one or more murrelets. Murrelets typically fly in pairs, as singles, or in small groups (Naslund

1993) and groups of murrelets were counted as a single detection when the detection was not separated by at least 5 seconds, as required by survey protocol.

An occupied behavior is when a murrelet is seen flying below canopy or circling (above or below canopy). All surveys were conducted according to the methods set out in the 1998 Pacific Seabird Group (PSG) protocol (HCP 6.1.3.3). All surveys were conducted by members of Mad River Biologists and O'Brien Biological Consulting. All surveyors have received training and evaluation in marbled murrelet survey techniques. A total of 136 protocol surveys were conducted by the contractors. See Table 1 and Appendices for survey dates and outcomes.

Radar surveys were conducted from 75 min. prior to sunrise to 75 min. after sunrise at 6 Reserve sites and 8 MMCA sites (Figure 2). In 2013 radar surveys were again conducted by marbled murrelet biologist Adam Brown. Mr. Brown has been trained in HRC HCP radar techniques by HRC wildlife biologist Mark Freitas as per training techniques used throughout this study by Alaska Biological Research, Pacific Lumber Company, and HRC. See Appendices for the radar survey protocol.

In 2013, each site ( $n = 14$ ) was surveyed 4 times during the breeding season for a total of 56 radar surveys (See Table 1 in the "Marbled Murrelet Effectiveness Monitoring 2013 Third Quarter Report" and Appendices for dates and outcomes of individual radar surveys).

We used Furuno® FR-1510 Mark-3 high-performance X-band radar that transmits  $9410 \pm 30$  MHz with a peak power output of 12 kW. This radar used a 2 m antenna that was mounted on a pick-up truck 3.5 m above the ground. We set the antenna to rotate at 24 times per min and to scan a circular area with a 1.5 km radius (707 ha) with a pulse length set at 0.07  $\mu$ sec. To be classified as a murrelet, radar targets had to be traveling at least 64 km per hr (Cooper et al. 2001), and leave an echo trail of  $\geq 3$  blips after 4 antenna sweeps. Single and multiple murrelets flying within a few meters of each other appear as a single echo on a radar screen (Burger 1997), and so each echo trail was counted as a single detection. (For further details, refer to "Conducting radar surveys for marbled murrelets: HCP Effectiveness monitoring protocol" [version 1.2] in Appendices).

Images on the radar screen were recorded using an Epiphan VGA2USB frame grabber device, and reviewed for murrelet targets that might have been missed during the survey.

## **ANALYSES OF SURVEY DATA**

The purpose of the effectiveness monitoring program is to determine the continued occupancy of the Reserves and MMCA stands so that the impacts of management and conservation measures on occupancy patterns can be assessed (HCP 6.1.3). At the 1999 MMSRP meeting, the MMSRP recommended that “trends in the MMCAs collectively should be considered to how they respond relative to the ‘control’ study areas in the reserves” (HRSP and HFR) (MMSRP 1999). Thus, this study was not designed to detect trends in individual MMCAs, Reserves or stands within them.

A general linear mixed model was used to model spatio-temporal variation in  $\ln + 1$  transformed radar counts from 2002 to 2013. Results from 2009 were not used due to a reduced survey effort that year. Mixed models can accommodate both fixed and random effects (Littell et al. 1996). Surveys that started >5 minutes late or ended >5 minutes early were not included in these analyses (all surveys met timing requirements in 2013).

The Land-type (Reserves and MMCAs) term was treated as a fixed effect to test for differences between MMCAs and Reserves. A linear Year term was used to test for a trend in counts, and the interaction between Land-type and linear year. Year was used to test the hypothesis that slopes of the linear year effects differed between MMCAs and Reserves. Survey day was added as a linear continuous effect to account for an increase in counts later in the season (e.g. Rodway et al. 1993, Jodice and Collopy 2000).

We also included annual estimates of the Northern Oscillation Index (NOI) and Sea Surface Temperature (SST) as covariates to explore the relationship between inland counts and indices of ocean productivity. Sea surface temperature data (°C) were averaged (SST\_AVE) from NOAA buoys (Station 46022 - EEL RIVER - 17NM West-Southwest of Eureka, CA and Station 46027 - ST GEORGES - 8NM West Northwest of Crescent City, CA) and Northern Oscillation Index (NOI). Data were from [www.pfeg.noaa.gov](http://www.pfeg.noaa.gov).

Finally, categorical Year and Site nested within Land-type were treated as random effects where categorical Year was a categorical factor with ten levels (2002-2013, excluding 2009). It was

assumed that the error term described the within-site variation. Restricted maximum likelihood estimation was first used to model the following covariance structures: variance component, compound symmetric, first-order autoregressive, and heterogeneous autoregressive (Littell et al. 1996). However, only the model with compound symmetric structure converged and this structure was therefore used to model fixed effects with full maximum likelihood estimation methods. All analyses were conducted by M.Z. Peery, Ph.D. using SAS v9.2.

For exploratory purposes, a similar analysis was conducted using the audio-visual survey data collected from 2000 to 2013. Survey day was added as a linear continuous effect to account for an increase in counts later in the season (e.g. Rodway et al. 1993, Jodice and Collopy 2000). As with the radar analyses, only the model with compound symmetric structure converged and this structure was therefore used to model fixed effects with full maximum likelihood estimation methods. Similar to the radar analyses, surveys that started >5 minutes late or ended >5 minutes early were not included in these analyses (all surveys met timing requirements in 2013).

## **RESULTS**

### **OCCUPANCY**

During 2013, surveyors observed occupied behaviors at 12 of the 33 audio-visual survey stations (Table 1). Occupied behaviors were observed at 5 of the 6 Reserve stations and at 7 of the 27 MMCA stations. Occupied behaviors were observed at all MMCA stands with the exception of Shaw Gift (Table 1).

In 2013, the annual proportion of Reserve stations with occupied behaviors was more than three times as great ( $0.83$ ,  $1SE = 0.15$ ) as the proportion of MMCA stations with occupied behaviors ( $0.26 \pm 0.08$ ; Figure 3a). Overall, the annual proportion of MMCA stations with occupied behaviors appears to be tracking the proportion of Reserve stations with occupied behaviors, although the proportion for the Reserve stations was the same in 2013, and there was a decrease in the MMCA proportion (one less station showed occupancy) (Figure 3a).

Occupied behaviors, as defined by circling murrelet targets, were observed at the HRSP Reserve stands and in the Allen Creek and Bell-Lawrence MMCAs on the radar surveys (Table 2, Figure 3b). Radar surveyors observed circling murrelet targets at 6 of the 14 sites (Table 2). Among

these sites, occupied behaviors were observed at 4 of the 6 Reserve radar sites and at 2 of the 8 MMCA radar sites. Similar to the AV surveys, the proportion of occupied behaviors observed at the Reserve sites in 2013 remained the same as in 2012, while the proportion observed at MMCA sites declined (Figure 3b).

### **INLAND MURRELET COUNTS USING RADAR: 2002-2013**

Due to the lower number of surveys conducted in 2009 it has again been excluded from the analysis of radar counts.

From the analysis of the years included we detected greater numbers of radar counts in Reserves (logarithm of least-squares means =  $3.18 \pm 0.25$ ) than in MMCAs (least-squares means =  $2.53 \pm 0.22$ ;  $F_{1,12} = 6.36$ ,  $p = 0.027$ ). Indeed, more than twice as many targets were detected in Reserves (mean = 37.3) compared to MMCAs (mean = 16.5). The linear Year term was significant ( $F_{1,578} = 3.90$ ,  $p = 0.049$ ) suggesting that, overall, radar counts changed linearly from 2002-2013.

However, the Land-type $\times$ Year interaction, which tests whether the slopes of the trend lines in the MMCAs and Reserves are different, was statistically significant ( $F_{1,578} = 6.26$ ,  $p = 0.013$ ), suggesting that trends in radar counts of murrelets in Reserves and MMCAs differed since 2002 (Figure 4).

The estimated slope associated with the linear Year term for radar counts in the Reserves ( $b = -0.001 \pm 0.014$ ) was not significantly different than zero ( $t_{578} = -0.09$ ,  $p = 0.925$ ). In contrast, the slope for MMCAs was significantly greater than zero ( $b = 0.040 \pm 0.012$ ;  $t_{578} = 3.34$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ), indicating that counts increased in the MMCAs but not in the Reserves. Julian date, NOI, and SST were not significant (all  $p$ 's  $> 0.50$ ), indicating that radar counts did not change during survey periods and were not associated with indices putatively indicative of marine productivity.

### **AUDIO-VISUAL COUNTS: 2000-2013 (EXPLORATORY)**

Although audio-visual detections are not used for trends monitoring, there is a longer history of audio-visual surveys than radar surveys on the HCP covered lands and Reserves. Several patterns do emerge after rigorous statistical analysis.

The Land-type by linear Year interaction, which tests whether the slopes of the trend lines in the MMCAs and Reserves are different, was not statistically significant ( $F_{1,1908} = 0.16, p = 0.693$ ), suggesting that trends in audio-visual murrelet detections in the Reserves and MMCAs were tracking each other during this period (Figure 5). After removing the non-significant Land-type by linear Year interaction, audio-visual counts were significantly greater in the Reserves (least-squares means =  $1.71 \pm 0.21$ ) than in the MMCAs (least-squares means =  $0.46 \pm 0.10$ ;  $F_{1,31} = 28.99, p < 0.001$ ). Means of raw audio-visual counts supported this result with about three times more detections in Reserves (11.3) than MMCAs (2.0). The linear Year term was significant ( $F_{1,1908} = 3.88, p = 0.049$ ), but the slope parameter ( $b = -0.010 \pm 0.011$ ) indicated that there was no overall trend in audio-visual detections since 2000.

Audio-visual counts were strongly and positively related to the Julian date of the survey ( $b = 0.006 \pm 0.001, F_{1,1908} = 9.94, p < 0.001$ ), but neither NOI or SST were significant predictors of AV counts ( $F_{1,1908} = 1.78, p = 0.076$  and  $F_{1,1908} = 1.54, p = 0.123$ , respectively).

### **At-sea numbers**

At-sea estimates of marbled murrelets for the HCP region in 2013 were not available at the time of this report. In 2012, the reported number of murrelets off-shore of the HCP region near southern Humboldt County declined from 2011 (Figure 10). The estimated number of murrelets in the HCP region from Trinidad to Shelter Cove (Zone 4, Stratum 2) was 521 (compared to 993 in 2011), with lower and upper 95% confidence limits of 158 - 944 (Falxa, et al. 2013).

## **DISCUSSION**

An objective of the HCP monitoring is to determine the continued occupancy of the MMCAs. In 2013, the AV survey results show continued murrelet occupancy in the surveyed Reserves and MMCAs with the exception of Shaw Gift (Table 1, Figure 3a). Of the surveyed MMCAs, while Allen Creek and Bell-Lawrence have more consistently exhibited occupancy over the survey period, Cooper Mill and Shaw Gift have been more inconsistent. There is no current explanation for the inconsistent nature of these occupied observations, or the lack thereof. There were no AV detections at Shaw-Gift in 2013. However, there were relatively high radar counts at the sites covering the Shaw-Gift MMCA (Table 2).



Although inconsistent at some, the continued observation of occupancy of the MMCAs via AV surveys over the study period is a potential indication that the HCP has not so far resulted in adverse changes in murrelet occupancy of these stands. Trends in AV detections at MMCAs and Reserves have tracked each other since 2000. After 14 years of AV monitoring there has been no overall trend in AV detections since the study began. The inconsistent nature of occupancy detections and of AV detections in general points out the limitations of AV surveys in which changes in conditions at a survey site (e.g. surrounding vegetation), can influence the ability to detect murrelets and their behaviors. Many of the current survey stations were selected up to 20 years ago based on the (then) good visibility at the site. Since that time, over 20 years of growth on conifers can significantly alter the visibility, causing a re-evaluation of the survey stations, and in some cases requiring some vegetation manipulation to improve conditions.

Analysis of radar tracked murrelets in the HCP Bioregion from 2002-2013 (excluding 2009) indicated that trends in counts differed between the MMCAs and Reserves, having detected greater numbers of radar-counted murrelets in the Reserves than in the MMCAs over the twelve-year period. However, the results also indicated that counts have increased in the MMCAs, but not in the Reserves (Figures 4 and 7). As radar is thought to best track numbers of nesting murrelets, this could mean that there has been an increase in murrelets using the MMCAs for nesting.

The results of the exploratory AV analysis above indicated that AV counts were significantly greater in the Reserves than in the MMCAs. The results were mixed as to whether AV detections have declined over the study period. The linear Year term was significant in the ANOVA; however the slope of the linear Year trend line was negative but not significant. Regardless, the trends in AV detections in the Reserves and MMCAs were similar (Figures 5, 8, and 9).

Interestingly, while there has been a positive trend in radar detections for the MMCAs (Figure 4), the MMCA trend in audio-visual detections was slightly negative (Figure 5), providing somewhat conflicting results. In contrast, the radar trend for the Reserves was stable, while the trend in audio-visual detections for the Reserves was slightly negative. Overall, radar has shown to be the better tool for tracking numbers of murrelets (e.g. Bigger et al. 2006a, 2006b).

During the development of the HCP conservation strategy it was predicted that murrelet counts and detections of occupancy would increase in the Reserves, and possibly in the MMCAs, as other occupied stands were harvested. The current trends in radar counts might be an indication that: 1) murrelets that were nesting in previously harvested stands have since moved to the MMCAs, and/or 2) that more first time breeders are choosing to nest in MMCAs. It will be interesting to note future results in trends given the significant change in forest management with the ownership change to HRC in 2008. HRC retains all old growth trees on the landscape, and provides protection for Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Type I and II old growth stands, in addition to continued protection of the MMCAs.

For radar counts Julian date, NOI and SST were not significant factors. In contrast, Julian date continues to exhibit a strong, positive relationship with AV counts. NOI and SST have not shown a relationship to AV counts.

At-sea counts of murrelets in the HCP bioregion have not changed significantly during the study period. For the five recovery zone area combined from 2001-2012 the trend analysis no longer shows a statistically significant population trend, where a decline was previously reported in the 2010 summary (Falxa et al. 2013). At the individual conservation zone scale, there was no decline reported for Zone 4 off of the north coast of California, including the HCP bioregion. A significant decline was only noted for Zone 2 (the outer coast of Washington). The completed 2013 analysis was not available at the time of this report.

Improved approaches to power analysis of murrelet inland survey data suggest that it is possible to detect annual declines in the murrelet population using radar or audio-visual approaches (Bigger et al. 2006a). Given that statistical power to detect trends and differences in trends was lower for audio-visual than radar surveys and radar counts reflected annual changes in the breeding population, the use of radar has been recommended to monitor inland populations of marbled murrelets and to estimate the effect of land management on local populations (Bigger et al. 2006a). As indicated by power analyses using the current radar monitoring design, it will take 10 years to detect a 5% difference in trends between murrelet populations in the Reserves and MMCAs with 87% power (Bigger 2005). 2013 was the eleventh year of surveys. To detect a 2.5% difference between populations with at least 80% power, it will take 15 years of radar

surveys at the same 8 MMCA and 6 Reserve sites where each site is visited 4 times per year (Bigger 2005).

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- No change in monitoring strategies or intensity is recommended at this time.
- Continue using AV and radar surveys for HCP effectiveness monitoring of the breeding murrelet population in the HCP Bioregion.
- Continue to use any ancillary data (e.g., offshore counts of murrelets, ocean conditions); if possible, to infer whether changes in annual trends in radar counted murrelets are associated with management activity.

## LITERATURE CITED

- Becker, B. H., Z. M. Peery, and S. R. Beissinger. 2007. Ocean climate affects trophic level and reproductive success of an endangered seabird, the Marbled Murrelet. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 329:267-279.
- Bigger, D. 2005. Pacific Lumber Co. Habitat Conservation Plan: Marbled Murrelet Inland Monitoring Annual Report 2004. (Unpublished Report), 27 pages.
- Bigger, D. 2007. Pacific Lumber Co. Habitat Conservation Plan: Marbled Murrelet Inland Monitoring Annual Report 2006. (Unpublished Report), 37 pages.
- Bigger, D., M. Z. Peery, J. Baldwin, S. Chinnici and S. Courtney. 2006a. Power to detect trends in marbled murrelet populations using audio-visual and radar surveys. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 70:493-504.
- Bigger, D., M. Z. Peery, S. Chinnici, and S. Courtney. 2006b. Efficacy of audio-visual and radar surveys for studying marbled murrelets in inland habitats. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 70(2):505-516.
- Burger, A. E. 1997. Behavior and numbers of marbled murrelets measured with radar. *Journal of Field Ornithology*. 68:208-223.
- Cooper, B. A., M. G. Raphael, and D. Evans Mack. 2001. Radar-based monitoring of marbled murrelets. *Condor* 103:219-229.
- Falxa, G., J. Baldwin, D. Lynch, S.L. Miller, S.K. Nelson, S.F. Pearson, M.G. Raphael, C. Strong, T. Bloxton, B. Galleher, B. Hogoboom, M. Lance, and R. Young. 2011. Marbled murrelet effectiveness monitoring, Northwest Forest Plan: 2009 and 2010 summary report. 26 pp.
- Falxa, G., M.G. Raphael, J. Baldwin, D. Lynch, S.L. Miller, S.K. Nelson, S.F. Pearson, C. Strong, T. Bloxton, M. Lance, and R. Young. 2013. Marbled murrelet effectiveness monitoring, Northwest Forest Plan: 2011 and 2012 summary report. 27 pp.
- Falxa, G. Personal communication. 1/8/2014.
- Jodice, P. G. and M. W. Collopy. 2000. Activity patterns of marbled murrelets in Douglas-fir old-growth forests of the Oregon coast range. *Condor* 102:275-285.
- Littell, R. C., G. A. Milliken, W. W. Stroup, and R. D. Wolfinger. 1996. SAS System for mixed models. SAS Institute, Cary, North Carolina, USA.
- Madsen, S., Evans, D., Hamer, T., Henson, P., Miller, S., Nelson, S. K., Roby, D., and M. Stapanian. 1999. Marbled murrelet effectiveness monitoring plan for the Northwest Forest Plan. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-439. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. 51 p.

MMSRP 1999. Preliminary meeting minutes HCP marbled murrelet monitoring, December 13-14, 1999. 15 pages.

MMSRP 2004. Recommendations, Memo from Dr. Barry Noon to PALCO, DFG, and FWS, April 5, 2004, 4 pages.

Miller, S. L. Personal communication. 12/18/2006.

Naslund, N. 1993. Why do marbled murrelets attend old growth forest nesting areas year-round? *Auk* 110:594-602.

PALCO 1999. Habitat conservation plan for the properties of The Pacific Lumber Company, Scotia Pacific Company LLC, and Salmon Creek Corporation. The Pacific Lumber Company, Scotia, California, USA.

Peery, M. Z., S. R. Beissinger, S. H. Newman, B. H. Becker, E. Burkett, and T. D. Williams. 2004. Individual and temporal variability in inland flight behavior of marbled murrelets: implications for population monitoring. *Condor* 106:344-353.

Rodway, M. S., H. M. Regehr, and J. P. L. Savard. 1993. Activity patterns of marbled murrelets in old-growth forest in the Queen Charlotte Islands, British Columbia. *Condor* 95:831-848.

**Table 1. Mean annual counts\* of total detections at audio-visual survey stations from 2000-2013.**

Location	Station	Habitat <sup>a</sup>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Allen Creek MMCA	HM0104	OG	0.0	1.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.8	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.4	0.6	1.2
	HM0105	OG	<b>1.6</b>	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.8	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.8	0.0	<b>2.4</b>	0.0
	HM0107	OG	<b>4.4</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	7.3	<b>0.3</b>	<b>15.6</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>10.5</b>	5.8	<b>6.0</b>
	HM0109	OG	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>1.5</b>	0.0	0.8	0.0	<b>1.0</b>	3.2	0.4	<b>1.2</b>	0.0	0.4
	HM0111	OG	4.2	14.6	1.0	0.7	0.8	<b>0.3</b>	1.2	2.4	1.0	0.8	4.4	1.8	1.4	0.8
	HM0124	OG	<b>12.8</b>	2.2	2.8	1.5	<b>11.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>8.3</b>	0.0	<b>4.0</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>3.8</b>	0.8	<b>1.0</b>	<b>3.2</b>
	HM1013	R	0.0	0.6	2.4	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.8	3.2	0.4	1.0	0.2	0.0
	HM1106	R	<b>5.2</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>16.0</b>	3.3	<b>8.0</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>
	HM1107	R	0.8	<b>1.4</b>	<b>9.0</b>	1.0	<b>3.0</b>	<b>1.3</b>	0.6 <sup>c</sup>	<b>5.6</b>	4.4	<b>6.6</b>	0.2	0.0	0.0	1.0
	HM2501	OG	<b>3.0</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>13.3</b>	1.0	<b>8.6</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>9.75</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>8.5</b>
	HM2502	R	<b>5.4</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>6.5</b>	4.0	<b>2.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.0</b>
Bell-Lawrence MMCA	HM0201	OG	0.4	0.0	<b>1.2</b>	<b>3.2</b>	0.4	0.7	<b>25.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.5</b>	0.0	<b>2.4</b>	0.0	0.0
	HM1203A	OG	0.0	0.2	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.2	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	HM1204	OG	<b>3.2</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>3.8</b>	0.3	<b>5.3</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.3</b>	1.4	<b>1.6</b>	0.0	0.0	<b>0.3</b>	0.8	<b>0.3</b>
	HM1206	OG	<b>8.4</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.0<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>4.0</b>	1.4	<b>16.5</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
	HM1306	R	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.5	0.0	<b>3.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0
	HM2301	OG	0.0	<b>2.6</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2
	HM2302	OG	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	<b>5.3</b>	0.0	0.4	<b>1.3</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cooper Mill MMCA	HM0804B	R	1.4	0.0	0.4	<b>2.8</b>	0.2	<b>1.8</b>	1.8	<b>18.0</b>	<b>4.8</b>	0.0	<b>0.3</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.3</b>	0.0
	HM0808	R	0.0	<b>0.4</b>	0.2	<b>1.0</b>	0.4	0.0	<b>2.7</b>	2.0	6.0	0.4	<b>0.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.0</b>
	HM0813	R	0.4	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>3.2</b>	0.0	0.2	<b>3.0<sup>a</sup></b>	4.0	1.3	1.2	<b>1.6</b>	0.8	1.0	1.6
Shaw Gift MMCA	HM0405	OG	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	0.4	0.2	0.0	0.0	<b>0.8</b>	<b>9.0</b>	0.0
	HM0413	OG	2.2	<b>0.4</b>	0.0	<b>2.0</b>	0.8	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
	HM0503	R	0.0	0.0	<b>0.5</b>	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	HM0707	OG	<b>1.0</b>	0.0	0.2	<b>0.5</b>	0.0	0.0	<b>1.0</b>	0.0	<b>0.3</b>	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0
	HM0906	R	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	HM2401	R	0.0	<b>0.3</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0
HFR Reserve	CM0105A	OG	0.0	<b>4.8</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>12.2</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>18.0<sup>b</sup></b>	3.4	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>1.0</b>
	CM0207	OG	<b>3.6</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>5.0</b>
	DM0103	OG	<b>31.2</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>78.8</b>	<b>20.7</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>46.0</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>19.0<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>42.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>7.7</b>
HRSP Reserve	ZM0101	OG	<b>4.4</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>14.8</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>41.5</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>
	ZM0108	OG	1.2	<b>36.2</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>5.0</b>	7.4	<b>9.5</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>5.0</b>
	ZM0110	OG	<b>0.6</b>	<b>1.4</b>	4.8	5.8	<b>5.7</b>	0.0	10.2	1.6	8.0	<b>16.6</b>	3.2	<b>4.6</b>	2.2	1.6

\*Counts in bold indicate observation of occupied behaviors.

<sup>a</sup> OG = un-harvested old growth and R = residual old growth (Figure 1).

<sup>b</sup> A survey with the observed occupied behaviors was not included in analysis of count data.


<sup>c</sup> A survey with presence detections was not included in analysis of count data.

**Table 2. Mean annual counts\* of marbled murrelets at radar sites in the HCP Bioregion from 2002-2013.**

Location	Site	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Allen Creek MMCA	R21	<b>44.7</b>	<b>28.3</b>	<b>40.3</b>	<b>25.3</b>	<b>32.5</b>	<b>62.0</b>	<b>19.3</b>	<b>46.7</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>47.0</b>	<b>22.8</b>	<b>19.0</b>
	R35	<b>10.8</b>	<b>8.5</b>	12.8	<b>10.8</b>	9.0	<b>17.8</b>	<b>12.3</b>	9 <sup>a</sup>	<b>16.3</b>	13.3	<b>21.0</b>	11.0
	R48	8.7	20.0	7.8	26.6	22.0	16.7	48.3	48 <sup>a</sup>	17.8	22.3	20.8	10.3
Bell-Lawrence MMCA	R60	-	<b>6.8</b>	19.3	13.3	<b>11.8</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>8.5</b>	18.5	11.0	16.8	9.0	<b>14.0</b>
Cooper Mill MMCA	R14	5.8	10.3	8.5	12.3	<b>10.8</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>18.3</b>	22 <sup>a</sup>	13.8	20.8	<b>21.3</b>	9.8
Shaw Gift MMCA	R16	8.0	6.0	4.3	5.5	8.3	6.8	10.5	9 <sup>a</sup>	9.3	<b>13.0</b>	<b>20.0</b>	11.3
	R36	<b>9.0</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>16.8</b>	9.0	<b>28.0</b>	5.8	25 <sup>a</sup>	13.3	<b>24.3</b>	7.5	11.5
	R37	<b>20.3</b>	1.5	3.5	8.0	6.0	10.7	5.0	50 <sup>a</sup>	14.8	21.0	32.0	20.5
HFR (Reserve)	R45	20.0	4.0	17.0	3.0	3.5	<b>20.3</b>	7.5	37 <sup>a</sup>	12.0	<b>27.3</b>	14.8	16.5
	R63	-	8.0	8.8	<b>9.0</b>	3.8	<b>9.8</b>	<b>6.3</b>	11 <sup>a</sup>	<b>2.3</b>	13.0	10.0	5.8
HRSP (Reserve)	R03	<b>81.3</b>	<b>60.5</b>	<b>92.5</b>	<b>74.8</b>	<b>53.3</b>	<b>92.0</b>	<b>73.8</b>	<b>108.5</b>	<b>62.0</b>	<b>102.8</b>	<b>95.5</b>	<b>87.0</b>
	R13	<b>41.8</b>	<b>29.0</b>	<b>39.3</b>	<b>30.3</b>	<b>53.0</b>	<b>48.3</b>	<b>70.7</b>	<b>143</b>	31.3	<b>41.5</b>	<b>47.3</b>	<b>35.8</b>
	R34	<b>45.0</b>	<b>26.8</b>	<b>43.8</b>	<b>37.0</b>	<b>43.3</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>27.8</b>	12 <sup>a</sup>	<b>25.8</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>11.5</b>
	R61	<b>61.3</b>	34.5	<b>38.5</b>	<b>56.5</b>	<b>30.0</b>	<b>33.0</b>	<b>48.3</b>	82 <sup>a</sup>	50.3	<b>50.5</b>	<b>57.3</b>	<b>53.0</b>


\*Counts in bold indicate the observation of occupied (circling) behaviors.

<sup>a</sup> One survey.




HRC Map Legend.





**Figure 1(a). Location of all marbled murrelet stations surveyed for effectiveness monitoring in 2013: Bell-Lawrence MMCA.**


Radar sites and scanning area were included.



**Figure 1(b). Location of all marbled murrelet stations surveyed for effectiveness monitoring in 2013: Shaw Gift MMCA.**


Radar sites and scanning area were included.





**Figure 1(c-2). Location of all marbled murrelet stations surveyed for effectiveness monitoring in 2013: Headwater Forest Reserve.**

Radar sites and scanning area were included.



**Figure 1(d). Location of all marbled murrelet stations surveyed for effectiveness monitoring in 2013: Cooper Mill MMCA.**

Radar sites and scanning area were included.






Figure 1(e). Location of all marbled murrelet stations surveyed for effectiveness monitoring in 2013: Allen Creek MMCA.

Radar sites and scanning area were included.



**Figure 1(f). Location of all marbled murrelet stations surveyed for effectiveness monitoring in 2013: Humboldt Redwoods State Park.**


Radar sites and scanning area were included.




**Figure 2. Marbled Murrelet Conservation Areas in southern Humboldt County, CA, and location of radar sites surveyed for marbled murrelet effectiveness monitoring.**

The scanned area of the radar (1.5 km radius) is included on map.






a)




b)

**Figure 3. a) Annual proportion of AV effectiveness monitoring stations with occupied behaviors from 2000 to 2013 in Reserves and MMCAs. b) Annual proportion of radar sites with observed circling behaviors from 2002 to 2013 in Reserves and MMCAs.**

In 2001, 2004, 2009, and 2011 occupied behaviors were observed at all Reserve stations so SE was zero. In 2007, circling behaviors were observed at all Reserve stations so SE was zero.



**Figure 4. Estimated number of radar detected marbled murrelets per survey (annual means) and trend lines at survey sites in Reserves and MMCAs from 2002 to 2013 (excluding 2009).**



**Figure 5. Estimated number of audio-visual detections per survey (annual means) and trend lines for marbled murrelets in Reserves and MMCAs from 2000 to 2013.**




Figure 6. Annual mean radar detections (95% CI) in Reserves 2002-2013 (excluding 2009).




Figure 7. Annual mean radar detections (95% CI) in MMCA's 2002-2013 (excluding 2009).




Figure 8. Annual mean audio-visual (AV) detections (95% CI) in Reserves 2000-2013.





Figure 9. Annual mean audio-visual (AV) detections (95% CI) in MMCAs 2000-2013.



**Figure 10. Mean annual number of marbled murrelets at-sea in the HCP region from Trinidad to Shelter Cove (Zone 4, Stratum 2) 2000-2012.**

The 2000-2006 estimates are preliminary (S. Miller, USFS, pers. comm.). The 2007-2011 estimates are also preliminary (G. Falxa, USFWS, pers. comm.).

NOTE: 2013 at-sea estimates of the marbled murrelet population were not available at the time of this writing. The marbled murrelet monitoring team will not be meeting until 3 March 2014 to review and finalize the 2013 at-sea estimates (Falxa, pers. comm.).