



**Humboldt
Redwood™**

Northern Spotted Owl Annual Report

2018

February 1, 2019



Cover photo: Northern spotted owl adult taking a mouse (photo credit: HRC Forest Sciences).

TWENTIETH ANNUAL REPORT

**Submitted to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the California
Department of Fish and Wildlife, the NOAA Fisheries, and the California
Department of Forestry and Fire Protection**

By

Humboldt Redwood Company, LLC

**To fulfill the requirements of the Habitat Conservation Plan, 6.2, Northern
Spotted Owl Conservation Plan**

February 1, 2019

Project Managers/ Primary Authors

Brad S. Mauney

Brad Mauney

Sal Chinnici

Sal Chinnici

Project Description

Title: Northern Spotted Owl Annual Report 2018

Purpose: Northern spotted owl HCP monitoring

Date Initiated: March 1999

Projected End Date: Ongoing

Manager: Sal Chinnici, Manager, Forest Sciences, and Brad Mauney, Lead Wildlife Biologist

Report Summary

During the 2018 northern spotted owl survey season a total of 956 calling stations were used to conduct nighttime surveys of the sample quadrats and Timber Harvesting Plans (THP). A total of 949 daytime status and follow-up visits were conducted. All core sites and all activity sites within the sample quadrats were visited to determine occupancy, reproductive status, and reproductive success (if applicable).

Management objective 1 of the HCP, which requires the maintenance of a minimum of 108 activity sites in the HCP area, was met in 2018 with 126 total occupied activity sites including the 108 core sites. There are currently 222 total activity sites (occupied and unoccupied) on the property. Management objective 2, which calls for maintenance of spotted owl pairs on a five-year running average of 80% of core activity sites, was not met in 2018 with a five-year running average of 76.5%. The pair occupancy rate for 2018 alone was 70.4% (76 of the 108 core sites were occupied by a pair of spotted owls). Management objective 3 requires the maintenance of a five-year running average reproductive rate of at least 0.61 fledged young per pair for the core sites (for those pairs monitored to determine reproductive output). Nesting activity was verified for 31 of the 76 pairs (of the 108 core sites), and a total of 36 young were fledged, resulting in a reproductive rate of 0.47 in 2018. The five-year running average of the reproductive rate for the twentieth year of the HCP is 0.44, below the metric for management objective 3.

In February of 2014 HRC and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service completed a minor modification to the HCP that resulted in a timing requirement for THP surveys and an adaptive

management requirement for occupancy and probability of detection analysis of HRC spotted owl surveys that have guided survey methods.

Because the northern spotted owl was elevated to the status of a candidate for state listing at that time, HRC requested and received a Consistency Determination from the California Department of Wildlife that the conservation measures of the HCP are consistent with the California Endangered Species Act. In 2016 the California Fish and Game Commission determined that the northern spotted owl should be listed as threatened under the California Endangered Species Act.

HRC continues to have concerns about various threats to our spotted owl population, represented primarily by barred owls. The continuing invasion of barred owls has the potential to reduce or eliminate the HRC spotted owl population regardless of other effects.

We currently recommend continuing the same monitoring strategies for the 2019 season.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

INTRODUCTION 2

STUDY AREA AND METHODS 5

 Monitoring, Timber Harvesting Plan (THP), and Site Preparation Surveys 6

 Monitoring Surveys6

 Timber Harvesting Plan (THP) Surveys8

 Site Preparation Surveys9

 Activity Site Determination 10

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 10

 Barred Owls 11

 West Nile Virus (WNV) 16

 Sudden Oak Death (SOD)..... 16

 Follow-up Visits..... 17

 Management Objectives 1 and 4..... 18

 Management Objective 2 20

 Management Objective 3 20

 Activity Site Levels of Protection..... 24

 Habitat Conditions27

 Banding Program 32

 Regional Trends 32

RECOMMENDATIONS 33

 Surveys..... 33

 Banding 34

 Barred Owls 34

 Scientific Panel/Management Objectives 34

PROJECT REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST

Susan Sniado
California Department of Fish & Wildlife
Northern California - North Coast Region
610 2nd Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Alan Franklin, Ph.D.
USDA/APHIS
National Wildlife Research Center
4101 LaPorte Ave
Fort Collins, CO 80521-2154

Steven Courtney, Ph.D.
735 State St. Suite 300
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Dominik Schwab
Cal Fire
135 Ridgeway Avenue
Santa Rosa, 95401

John Peters
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office
1655 Heindon Rd.
Arcata, CA 95521

Barry Noon, Ph.D.
Colorado State University
Department of Fisheries & Wildlife Biology
Fort Collins, CO 80523

Clarence Hostler
NOAA Fisheries
1655 Heindon Road
Arcata, 95521

Kurt McCray
Cal Fire
118 South Fortuna Blvd
Fortuna, CA 95540

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The year 2018 was the twentieth year of surveys and monitoring under the Northern Spotted Owl Conservation Plan (Habitat Conservation Plan or HCP §6.2) of the Humboldt Redwood Company (HRC) HCP. The intent of this report is to briefly summarize the methods, results, and management objectives of this conservation plan. As with previous reports, relevant appendices have been copied to a CD along with this report.

During the 2018 survey season we continued to rely upon the changes in survey methods resulting from the HCP minor modifications of 2002. Monitoring surveys were accomplished using 475 calling stations to cover all potential spotted owl habitat within the 2018 sample quadrats. Overall, a total of 894 calling stations were used to conduct nighttime surveys of the quadrats and Timber Harvesting Plan (THP) surveys. Follow-up visits were conducted to the locale of night contacts to determine the status and location of the owls contacted. A total of 949 daytime status and follow-up visits were conducted. All core sites, and all activity sites within the sample quadrats, were visited to determine occupancy, reproductive status, and reproductive success (if applicable).

Management objective 1 of the HCP requires the maintenance of a minimum of 108 activity sites¹ in the HCP area over the life of the permit. There were 126 total occupied activity sites in 2018, including the 108 core sites. Therefore, management objective 1 was met in 2018. Management objective 2 calls for maintenance of spotted owl pairs on a five-year running average of 80% of the core activity sites in the HCP area. In 2018, 76 of the 108 cores sites were occupied by a pair of spotted owls, for a pair occupancy rate of 70.4% (0.704). The five-year running average for the occupancy rate by pairs is now 76.5% (0.765). Management objective 3 requires the maintenance of a five-year running average reproductive rate of at least 0.61 fledged young per pair for the core sites (for those pairs monitored to determine reproductive output). During the 2018 breeding season, 76 pairs (of the 108 core sites) were monitored for nesting activity and

¹ **Activity site** (or activity center) is the area surrounding and including the nest tree or primary roost tree of a pair of spotted owls or single spotted owl, and where they are consistently located.

reproductive output. Nesting activity was verified for 31 of the 76 pairs. A total of 36 young were fledged, resulting in a reproductive rate of 0.47. The five-year running average of the reproductive rate for the twentieth year of the HCP was 0.44 (0.440); therefore it does not meet the target for management objective 3.

In February of 2014 HRC and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) completed a minor modification to the HCP that resulted in an additional timing requirement for THP surveys and an adaptive management requirement for occupancy and probability of detection analysis of HRC spotted owl surveys. Further detail is provided below.

Because the northern spotted owl was elevated at that time to the status of a candidate for state listing, HRC requested and received a Consistency Determination from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department or CDFW) that the conservation measures of the HCP are consistent with the California Endangered Species Act.

HRC continues to have concerns about various threats to our spotted owl population, represented primarily by barred owls, but also including West Nile Virus, potential poisoning threats from trespass and adjacent marijuana grows, and sudden oak death. Individually or in concert these stressors have the potential to reduce or eliminate the HRC spotted owl population or habitat regardless of HCP effects. At present, the actual effect of these factors on our population is unknown, although the negative effects of the barred owl invasion are well-documented throughout the range of the northern spotted owl.

We currently recommend continuing the same monitoring strategies for the 2019 season, including the continued implementation of the revised THP survey requirements related to the occupancy and detection probability analysis completed in 2015.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Northern Spotted Owl (spotted owl or NSO) twentieth Annual Report is to present the results of surveys and analyses of management objectives for the northern spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*) on lands of the Humboldt Redwood

Company, LLC (HRC) covered by the HRC Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS, the Service) Permit TE828950-0.

The reporting period is from 1 January 2018 to 1 January 2019, and covers surveys conducted from March to August 2018. The year 2018 was the twentieth year of surveys and monitoring under the Northern Spotted Owl Conservation Plan (HCP §6.2).

Regarding annual surveys, or censuses, HCP §6.2.2 # 2 states:

Monitoring data shall be provided annually to the NSOSRP (Northern Spotted Owl Scientific Review Panel), the USFWS, and CDFW (California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Department).

As stated in HCP §6.2, the overall conservation strategy for spotted owls is a habitat-based approach that includes the harvest, retention, and recruitment of habitat and essential habitat elements at both the landscape and activity site levels. The strategy also includes measures for disturbance minimization, population monitoring, and adaptive management techniques.

During the twentieth year of HCP implementation, the northern spotted owl program continues to follow the “quadrat” sampling approach and minor modifications approved in 2002 to monitor the “core” owl sites for occupancy and reproduction.

These minor modifications approved in 2002 consisted of three primary components: 1) clarification that the HCP’s spotted owl management objectives apply to the “core” (i.e., Level 1 and Level 2 owl sites, 2) modification of the census techniques to concentrate on sampling “quadrats” made up of watershed units on the covered lands, and 3) modification of survey methods for site preparation activities, recognizing that these activities are different in nature from timber harvesting relative to breeding season disturbance. These minor modifications to the HCP have been appended to previous reports, and are incorporated here by reference.

During a September 2003 meeting we also continued discussions with the USFWS and the CDFW regarding the evaluation for retention or removal of activity sites. These discussions eventually led to the development of a mutually agreed-upon survey methodology for removal of unoccupied sites from the list of activity sites.

In 2009 the Habitat Retention Area (HRA) strategy was fully implemented. The HRAs are intended to provide long-term nesting and roosting habitat around the most productive NSO activity centers. The USFWS, CDFW, and HRC reviewed habitat and other maps, aerial photography, and known NSO locations to identify HRAs for 80 Level 1 NSO activity centers. The HRAs were developed for activity centers that have a history of occupancy and reproduction. Because a proportion of these sites may be unoccupied in some years, the HRAs are intended to continue to provide nesting and roosting habitat during these unoccupied years given that they may become reoccupied over time. If a Level 1 HRA is unoccupied, a replacement Level 1 activity center is selected from other available sites meeting required criteria. There are currently twenty-one unoccupied HRAs; consequently we are currently maintaining a total of 101 Level One sites.

On 27 December, 2013 the California Fish and Game Commission adopted the Department's findings that the listing of the northern spotted owl as a threatened or endangered species under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) may be warranted, resulting in candidate status for the spotted owl during the status review period. Under CESA, a candidate species receives protection from "take" as if it were listed, until such time as a status review is conducted and a final listing determination is made.

HRC, the Service, and the Department discussed NSO management and monitoring in light of this change in status, and agreed to a HCP minor modification regarding THP surveys and HCP adaptive management. HRC agreed to conduct an occupancy and probability of detection analysis of our NSO survey data from 2003 – 2014 to achieve a better understanding of how many day and/or nighttime surveys are necessary to detect spotted owls, considering the presence of barred owls in the region. The analysis was completed prior to the 2015 survey season, and will be revisited every five years, or as needed.

Subsequently, because the northern spotted owl is a federally covered species under the HRC HCP, HRC applied for a Consistency Determination through the Department and

received a concurrence letter on 20 February 2014. On 26 August, 2016, the California Fish and Game Commission voted to list the NSO as a threatened species in California.

This brief introduction of the 2018 spotted owl program is expanded below. In particular, this report discusses: 1) the study area and methods used in the assessment of spotted owls within that study area, 2) results of the survey efforts, 3) the meaning of the results both biologically and with respect to the management objectives of the HCP, and 4) HRC's year 2019 action plan for the spotted owl conservation plan.

STUDY AREA AND METHODS

The HRC HCP covered lands currently encompass approximately 209,000 acres and are located in coastal Humboldt County in northern California (Map 1). The HCP area is characterized by mountainous terrain, a maritime climate, and dense coniferous forests, primarily dominated by the coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) and Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) forest-types.

In general, field survey methods for spotted owls are conducted following guidelines in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service protocol, "Protocol for Surveying Proposed Management Activities That May Impact Northern Spotted Owls" (USFWS 1992). During the 2011 survey season we began to incorporate changes proposed by the USFWS for northern spotted owl surveys in a revised protocol (2011 Northern Spotted Owl Survey Protocol, USFWS 2011a). For example, we used digitally recorded and amplified spotted owl calls consisted of a mix of standard territorial calls (e.g. 4 and 5 note calls), contact hoots and whistles, and agitated calls digitally recorded and broadcast using Wildlife Technologies® MA-15 electronic callers, or Fox Pro ® "Fury" or "Firestorm" electronic callers.

For all survey methods, when a spotted owl response is evoked during the nighttime surveys, presence, and if possible, status is determined with a follow-up daytime visit. Follow-up visits were conducted using daytime walk-ins of the habitat to attempt to locate nesting or roosting owls. Owl sites were checked to determine occupancy and nesting status. The surveyor walks in to a known site, or returns to the site of a survey

contact, and uses voice calling and/or amplified calls to contact the spotted owls which may be nesting or roosting at the site. The suitable habitat in an area roughly 0.5 mile around the previous contact is used as a search area. When a single owl, or a pair of spotted owls, is contacted on the follow-up visit the surveyor offers prey items (domestic mice) in an attempt to establish breeding status.

MONITORING, TIMBER HARVESTING PLAN (THP), AND SITE PREPARATION SURVEYS

As discussed above, minor modifications to the HCP that were approved by the CDFW and USFWS in 2002 affected the survey methodology for monitoring, THP, and site preparation activities. For monitoring, or census purposes, a quadrat sampling design was implemented to replace a complete census. THP survey methods were refined as a result of experience from the first three years of HCP implementation. In addition, surveys for site preparation activities were modified in recognition of the characteristics and duration of activities that are involved, and also of the potential for disturbance to spotted owls during the breeding season.

Monitoring Surveys

The Northern Spotted Owl Conservation Plan, HCP §6.2.2, # 2 reads:

PALCO shall conduct complete annual censuses to monitor all activity sites on the ownership and to determine numbers of pairs, nesting pairs, and reproductive rates. PALCO may use a sampling methodology, rather than a complete census, provided that the sampling proposal has been reviewed by the NSOSRP and approved by the USFWS and CDFW. Monitoring data shall be provided annually to the NSOSRP, the USFWS, and CDFW.

The USFWS, CDFW, NSOSRP, and PALCO had agreed that using a sampling methodology, rather than a complete census is likely to have several benefits for the population of spotted owls on HRC's covered lands as well as for HRC staff. Following agreement between PALCO, the USFWS, and the CDFW that the HCP management objectives (HCP §6.2.1) for pair occupancy and reproduction apply to the core sites as in HCP §6.2, Table 7, the objectives of a sampling methodology were therefore clarified.

Thus, the objectives of sampling a subset of the covered lands each year via night surveys include:

- Tracking known sites within the quadrats surveyed,
- Finding new sites that may be used as part of the minimum level (core) sites,
- Inventorying sites related to management activities, and
- Tracking the number and location of sites within a given geographical area over time, to help provide information on the effects of management activities.

The quadrat approach relies on large hydrologic areas containing multiple owl territories as the basic sampling units (Map 1). The hydrologic units are based on significant watershed areas (e.g. Freshwater Creek, Elk River), using the dividing ridgelines as the boundaries between units. Where necessary to maximize sampling efficiency, hydrologic units were combined into logical units, resulting in a total of 20 quadrats. In other words, if a hydrologic unit on the periphery of the covered lands contained a relatively small portion of HRC covered property, then it was incorporated into an adjoining, logical unit. During the 2018 season, quadrats 2, 7, 9, and 11 were sampled (Elk River, Stitz Creek, Root Creek and Bear Creek to Chadd Creek). The basic methods and reporting requirements of the quadrat sampling approach are as follows:

1. Using USFWS night survey protocol techniques, conduct three survey visits of all suitable habitat in the four quadrats for that sample year.
2. Use daytime follow-up visits (again using USFWS techniques) to check occupancy and reproductive status of all known sites in the quadrat (including any core sites).
3. In addition to the visits in item # 2, use daytime follow-up visits to check occupancy and status of any sites contacted on the night surveys.
4. In addition to calculating the values of pair occupancy and reproductive rate for the management objectives of HCP §6.2.1 for the core sites, also calculate the results of the same values for all sites monitored in the quadrats. These combined data will be used to track pair occupancy and reproductive trends over time, and

- will be compared to information gathered on spotted owls at other study sites in northern California.
5. Prior to 1 June each year HRC shall report to the USFWS and the CDFW on the quantity and distribution of suitable spotted owl habitat in the quadrats and on the covered lands as a whole. This information will be used to help understand potential reasons why management objectives may not be met, and potential means of correction (e.g., HCP §6.2.3 # 6).
 6. All survey and status visit results, as well as habitat information from item # 5, will be reported annually in the HCP Annual Report, due each year on 1 February.

Timber Harvesting Plan (THP) Surveys

The methods for surveying THPs in HCP §6.2.2 # 3 also underwent minor modification in 2002, as a result of discussions and agreement between the CDFW, USFWS and PALCO. Refinements in the THP surveys were primarily in the areas of timing of surveys, and clarification in procedural language. The modifications have been included in previous reports and correspondence, and are incorporated here by reference.

Additions were made to the THP survey language in 2009, and again in 2012, to clarify the meaning of “continuous operations”, as follows:

- (a) *Note: HRC and the Wildlife Agencies agree that in this context, “maintained continuously” means that:*
 - i) *Operations can only be shut down for a maximum of 5 consecutive days, including weekends,*
 - ii) *Only 3 of the 5 shut down days can be non-weather related,*
 - iii) *Operations must occur for 3 consecutive days between any consecutive 5 day shutdown period, and*
 - iv) *During any consecutive fixed 10 day period beginning February 21 there must be at least 5 days of operations.*
 - v) *If item iii) is applied, there must be 5 consecutive days of operations following the 5-day shutdown, 3-day operations, 5-day shutdown event.*
- (b) *In this context hauling of logs or equipment does not constitute “continuing operations”.*

Most recently, the February 2014 HCP minor modification required a change in survey timing, and an adaptive management requirement for a survey analysis, with the results intended to guide future survey effort.

THP survey modification:

For new operations, except site preparation, initiated in the period beginning February 21 and ending on or before August 31, the THP area and a 1,000-foot buffer shall be surveyed. Three survey visits, each separated by at least one week, shall occur prior to the start of operations, but after March 1. At least one visit shall occur on or after April 1. Survey efforts may be modified pursuant to HCP Section 6.2.3, Item 8 within the constraints of a minimum of three visits, and a maximum of six visits range. (Minor modification added language is underlined).

Adaptive management addition:

8. *In 2014, and at five-year intervals thereafter, HRC shall conduct an analysis of spotted owl occupancy and detection probabilities using their accumulated survey data. The analysis shall include appropriate covariates for other factors that explain detectability. The Wildlife Agencies will review the appropriateness of the analysis methods. The results will be evaluated to determine the appropriate number of night and/or daytime survey visits necessary to maintain $\geq .90$ confidence interval, (e.g., $CI = 1 - (1 - p_{survey})^{n_{surveys}}$) to detect a spotted owl, if present, for new operations initiated in the period beginning February 21 and ending on or before August 31. Survey efforts will be modified accordingly to maintain this confidence interval, within the constraints of a minimum of three visits, and a maximum of six visits range. HRC, the Wildlife Agencies, and/or the NSOSRP will meet to review the results and determine modifications, if necessary.*

During the 2018 survey season, for new timber operations we conducted six nighttime surveys of the THP area and buffer. There were thirty-two THPs that received six nighttime surveys and a subset of eight THPs that received continuous operations surveys.

SITE PREPARATION SURVEYS

Site preparation activities, e.g. those activities undertaken following timber harvest and in preparation for reforestation of a site, typically have little potential for disturbance of breeding, and are of relatively short duration (the methods of surveying for spotted owls for these kinds of activities also were subject to minor modification during 2002). Again, the surveys as described in the modified HCP §6.2.2 # 3 have been appended to previous reports. There were no site preparation-specific surveys conducted in 2018.

ACTIVITY SITE DETERMINATION

As in past years under the HCP, occupancy and reproductive criteria used were consistent with those outlined by the USFWS protocol, along with guidance received from the USFWS and the CDFW. Further, in 2002 the CDFW, USFWS and PALCO discussed and agreed upon a method for determining the establishment and also possibly the location of activity centers based on audio contacts only, and in 2003 agreed upon standards for removal of unoccupied sites. These methods have been discussed and appended in previous reports.

Following a resolution meeting and discussion with the Department, Service and the HCP Monitors in the fall of 2013, Appendix D was modified to include additional information regarding unoccupied activity centers. Based on those discussions and using the guidance of the “Decision Tree”, the following fifteen sites have been identified as unoccupied. However, considering the recent influx of barred owls and other factors HRC opted for a very conservative approach in 2018 and *have not* removed these sites from the GIS layer for 2018 (site location, watershed):

Table 1. HCP NSO Sites that met the criteria for dropped status but were retained.

| Site Number | Level 2017 | Level 2018 | Level Change | 2017 Status | 2018 Status | Site Name |
|-------------|------------|------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| 20 | THREE | THREE | no level change | N/C | N/C | Turkey Foot |
| 86 | THREE | THREE | no level change | N/C | N/C | Substation North |
| 169 | THREE | THREE | no level change | N/C | N/C | Bridge Creek/Elk River |
| 221 | THREE | THREE | no level change | N/C | N/C | Big Bend/SF Elk River |
| 231 | THREE | THREE | no level change | N/C | N/C | Mid Elk River |
| 248 | THREE | THREE | no level change | N/C | N/C | Pog Shed East |
| 259 | HREE | THREE | No level change | N/C | N/C | Stitz Creek |
| 296 | THREE | THREE | no level change | N/C | N/C | Brown's Gulch |
| 306 | THREE | THREE | no level change | N/C | N/C | Little North Fork Elk River |
| 307 | THREE | THREE | no level change | N/C | N/C | Pog Shed |
| 312 | THREE | THREE | no level change | N/C | N/C | Upper McWhinney Creek |
| 355 | THREE | THREE | no level change | N/C | N/C | Upper Lake Creek |
| 358 | THREE | THREE | no level change | N/C | N/C | Bible Camp NF Elk River |
| 371 | THREE | THREE | no level change | N/C | N/C | Mill C |
| 378 | THREE | THREE | no level change | U | N/C | Lower South Fork Elk River |

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Monitoring surveys were accomplished using 475 calling stations to cover all potential spotted owl habitat within the 2018 sample quadrats. In comparison, during the 2017 season we used 397 calling stations to cover the habitat within the sample quadrats on

HCP covered lands. Overall, a total of 894 calling stations were used to conduct nighttime surveys of the quadrats, activity centers and THPs in 2018.

Surveys in 2018 resulted in the equivalent of 3,398 nighttime survey visits, in comparison to 3,203 survey visits in 2017. Reasons for increased overall night surveys in 2018 include: 1) an increase in the number of surveys required from three to up to six surveys, 2) an increase in the number of stations used per unit area, and 3) an increase in the number of stations and survey visits required to locate known sites or conduct occupancy level surveys.

BARRED OWLS

HRC has continued tracking detections of barred owls (*Strix varia*), as did the previous landowner, since the species began responding to spotted owl calls on surveys starting in about 1991. Mapping of the detections and nest sites illustrates: 1) greater activity to date in the northern areas of the ownership, as would be expected given the known southward movement of the barred owl invasion, 2) greater numbers of detections along riparian corridors, and 3) an indication of barred owl preference for the old growth MMCA and reserves (Map 2).

Given the evidence from Washington, Oregon, and other regions of California that barred owls can have a significant impact on occupancy and reproduction of spotted owls in spite of habitat retention efforts (Anthony et al. 2004, Courtney et al. 2004, USFWS 2008, USFWS 2011b, Dugger et al. 2016), HRC remains concerned about the potential for barred owls to disrupt the management goals of the HCP for spotted owls. In fact, the Service has recognized that barred owls appear to be a greater threat to the recovery of spotted owls than was envisioned at the time of the spotted owl listing in 1990, and as a result has recommended immediate and coordinated action (USFWS 2008, USFWS 2011b).

Results of a pilot barred owl removal study on Green Diamond Resource Company lands in northern California has indicated that the lethal removal of barred owls allowed recovery of northern spotted owl populations in the treated (barred owl removal) portions

of the study area (Diller et al. 2016). Green Diamond has not conducted barred owl removal since 2014.

The USFWS began a barred owl removal study in 2013 on four study areas and by the end of the study period in 2018 had removed a total of 2,086 barred owls from the four study areas (Wiens et al. 2017, fws.gov/oregonfwo). A total of 365 barred owls have been removed from the Hoopa study area, which is the closest study area to the HRC HCP lands.

Preliminary results suggest that recolonization rates of post-removal landscapes by each owl species can vary considerably among and within study areas depending on the regional availability of surplus individuals (i.e. floaters) and site-specific environmental conditions that promote habitat use and territory establishment. According to Wiens et al. (2018) the initial experimental removals of barred owls had little measurable effect on occupancy and reproduction of spotted owls after the first 1-2 years of study implementation.

Barred owl activity in our study area continues to indicate that there are established barred owl territories with reproductively active pairs, in addition to a “floater” population. In 2018, there was an overall increase in the total number of barred owl detections, with 61 total detections, compared to 48 total detections in 2017 (Figure 1). Since we began tracking the barred owl invasion, there have been 51 Level 1 sites that have been displaced or disrupted by the presence of barred owls, including those shown below:

Table 1.5. Summary of Level One sites that have been affected by barred owls.

| Site Number | Level 2017 | Level 2018 | HRA/Current Replacement Level One | 2017 Status | 2018 Status | Site Name |
|-------------|------------|------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| 3 | ONE | ONE | HRA | N/C | N/C | McKay Dump East |
| 4 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PN1J | PU | Graham Gulch |
| 5 | ONE | ONE | HRA | F | N/C | Gills Mill |
| 9 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PNN | PU | Church Camp |
| 11 | ONE | ONE | HRA | N/C | N/C | Doe Creek |
| 13 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PU | PU | Lower Lake Creek |
| 14 | ONE | ONE | HRA | N/C | N/C | North Br. Elk River |
| 16 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PN1J | M | Upper Lake Creek |
| 19 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PNN | PU | Bell-Lawrence MMCA |
| 22 | ONE | ONE | HRA | F | PU | Upper Booths Run |
| 23 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PNN | PNF | Booths Run MMCA |
| 26 | ONE | ONE | HRA | N/C | M | Shaw Creek |
| 28 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PNN | M | Strongs Creek |
| 30 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PU | PU | South Fork Strongs Creek |
| 32 | ONE | ONE | HRA | N/C | N/C | Upper Cooper Mill MMCA |
| 33 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PU | N/C | Middle Cooper Mill MMCA |
| 41 | ONE | ONE | HRA | N/C | PN2J | Allen Creek MMCA |
| 50 | ONE | ONE | HRA | F | PN1J | Stitz Creek |
| 51 | ONE | ONE | HRA | N/C | M | B&D Ranch |
| 52 | ONE | ONE | HRA | N/C | N/C | Middle Stitz Creek |
| 58 | ONE | ONE | HRA | M | PU | Upper Howe Creek |
| 88 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PNF | PN2J | Greenlaw Creek |
| 97 | ONE | ONE | HRA | M | PNF | Bear Creek |
| 99 | ONE | ONE | HRA | U | F | Lower Chadd Creek |
| 125 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PN2J | PU | Lower Howe Creek |
| 130 | ONE | ONE | HRA | N/C | N/C | Corner Creek |
| 147 | ONE | ONE | HRA | U | U | Middle Bear Creek |
| 154 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PN2J | PNN | Keller Ranch West |
| 163 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PN1J | N/C | Lower Road 3/Yager Creek |
| 166 | ONE | ONE | HRA | N/C | F | Hely Creek |
| 170 | ONE | ONE | HRA | N/C | U | Blue Slide Creek |
| 196 | ONE | ONE | HRA | N/C | N/C | Nanning Creek |
| 201 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PNN | M | Kapple Creek West |

| Site Number | Level 2017 | Level 2018 | HRA/Current Replacement Level One | 2017 Status | 2018 Status | Site Name |
|-------------|------------|------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| 217 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PU | PU | SF Elk River |
| 218 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PU | F | RR Gulch |
| 234 | ONE | ONE | HRA | N/C | N/C | Elk River |
| 254 | ONE | ONE | HRA | M | U | Blue Slide Creek |
| 260 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PU | N/C | Little Salmon Creek |
| 272 | ONE | ONE | HRA | N/C | N/C | Lower McCloud Creek |
| 278 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PU | M | South Fork Strongs Creek |
| 293 | ONE | ONE | HRA | N/C | F | Lower Clapp Gulch |
| 319 | ONE | ONE | HRA | M | N/C | Substation South |
| 320 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PU | M | East Br. Bridge Creek |
| 321 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PU | PN2J | South Runenburg Camp |
| 329 | ONE | ONE | HRA | M | N/C | Stitz Creek |
| 331 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PNN | PNN | Lower Tom Gulch |
| 332 | ONE | ONE | HRA | N/C | N/C | Yager Creek MMCA |
| 540 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PU | PU | Grizzly Creek MMCA |
| 574 | ONE | ONE | HRA | PNN | PN1J | Grizzly Creek Park |
| 137 | ONE | ONE | Replacement | PN2J | PNN | Mid Atwell Creek |
| 377 | TWO | ONE | Replacement | PNN | PNF | Grizzly Creek |

N/C=no contact, M=single male, F=single female, P=pair, PU=pair unknown status, PN=pair nesting, PNN=pair non-nesting, PNF=pair nest failed, PN1J=pair nesting 1 juvenile, PN2J=pair nesting 2 juveniles.

The number of barred owl detections over time within 0.5 mile of spotted owl activity centers is shown in Figure 1. A linear trend line indicates an apparent increase over time.




Figure 1. Barred owl detections within 0.5 mile of spotted owl activity sites.

In 2018 there were eight detections of barred owls on night and daytime surveys at Level Three spotted owl sites including:

- 152 (Little Freshwater Creek)
- 153 (Upper Freshwater Creek)
- 7 (Dunlap Gulch)
- 139 (Stitz Creek)
- 98 (Allen Creek)
- 172 (Upper Grizzly Creek)
- 358 Lower Elk River
- 378 (Lower South Fork Elk River)
- 229 (Upper Elk Creek)
- 363 (Upper Elk Creek)

In contrast, over the last several years there have also been 14 activity sites that have been re-occupied by spotted owls after having been occupied by barred owls for a period of time: site 9 (North Fork Elk River), 11 (Doe Creek), 28 (Strongs Creek), 99 (Chadd Creek), 167 (Corbett Ranch), 260 (Gas Wells), 38 (Yager Creek), 287 (McCready

Gulch/Freshwater), 320 (Bridge Creek), 163 (Yager Creek), 88 (Greenlaw Creek), 346 (Yager Creek), 293 (Clapp Gulch), and 574 (Mt. Bemis-Grizzly Creek). See Map 2 for a map of all barred owl detections and nest sites located on HRC property.

WEST NILE VIRUS (WNV)

There is limited information on WNV to report for 2018. There was one human disease case reported in Humboldt County in 2018 (<https://diseasemaps.usgs.gov/mapviewer/>). However, WNV continues to have the potential to be a threat to the northern spotted owl range-wide, and specifically to the Klamath region population (Courtney et al. 2004).

WNV has been documented in other species in Humboldt County. Mosquitoes, the vector organism for WNV, are very prevalent in the area. WNV has the potential to disrupt HCP objectives regardless of the covered activities of the HCP; however, at the present time there are no avian diseases that appear to be significantly affecting spotted owl populations (USFWS 2008).

Blakesley *et al.* (2004) In USFWS (2010) offered two different scenarios for the possible outcomes of an infection by WNV of spotted owl populations:

- Spotted owls could tolerate severe, short-term population reductions caused by the virus because populations are widely distributed and number in the several thousands (see above also), and
- The virus will cause unsustainable mortality because of the frequency and/or magnitude of infection, thereby resulting in long-term population declines and extirpation from parts of the current range.

SUDDEN OAK DEATH (SOD)

The infection of hardwood species, especially tanbark oak (*Notholithocarpus densiflora* var. *densiflora*), by the invasive plant pathogen *Phytophthora ramorum* (Pythiaceae) and subsequent deterioration of spotted owl habitat has been raised as a threat (Courtney et al. 2004, Courtney et al. 2008, USFWS 2008). The pathogen is not a fungus or a bacterium, but a member of a unique group of organisms called oomycetes (water molds).

Oomycetes share some characteristics of fungi but are biologically different and more closely related to yeasts and brown algae.

The effects of this disease, known as Sudden Oak Death (SOD), could be especially harmful to spotted owl habitat in the Bear and Mattole watersheds on HRC lands where the hardwood component of habitat is most prevalent. Although the most recent evaluations of the extent of SOD in southern Humboldt County show only sporadic incidence (Courtney et al. 2008), continued monitoring indicates that these infestations are spreading and have reached the Decker Creek and Bull Creek watersheds on the southern boundary of HRC lands. Yearly weather patterns are thought to significantly influence the reproduction and spread of this disease.

SOD survey and monitoring results from 2008 to 2018 on HRC lands indicate evidence (positive stream samples and known infected trees) of the pathogen in the Canoe Creek, Decker Creek, Bull Creek, Thompson Creek, and Elk Creek planning watersheds as well as positive stream samples from the Lower Larabee planning watershed (the source of infection is likely off property to the east). All these sites are located in the greater Upper Eel watershed. In 2018 UC Davis Ag-Extension staff recovered positive SOD samples from the Chadd Creek watershed (nested in the greater Lower Eel /Eel River Delta watershed) but were unable to locate the source of the infection. There have also been positive stream samples taken from the Grizzly Creek and Stevens Creek planning watersheds in the greater Van Duzen watershed; the location and extent of the infection there is still under investigation. During the 2017 surveys stream samples taken from Yager Creek just below the confluence with Lawrence Creek in the greater Van Duzen watershed tested positive for the pathogen. Additional sample points on Yager Creek and Lawrence Creek; upstream of the confluence were tested in 2018 and results indicate that while Yager Creek is infected (source as yet unknown) Lawrence Creek appears to be free of the SOD pathogen, for now.

FOLLOW-UP VISITS

Timely follow-up visits were conducted to the locale of night contacts to determine the status and location of the owls contacted. All core spotted owl sites, and all activity sites within the sample quadrats (“quadrat sites”) were visited to determine occupancy, reproductive status, and reproductive success (if applicable). Other sites were visited to determine occupancy prior to the August designation of Level 1 sites.

A total of 949 daytime status and follow-up visits were conducted in 2018, compared to 812 in 2017. The increase in 2018 daytime visits is due to the required number of visits in an attempt to determine location, status, and reproductive success (if applicable) with lower detectability, most likely as a result of barred owls in the area.

Surveys and daytime status visits were conducted in order to collect data to determine the HCP management objectives (HCP §6.2.1) for the core sites, as discussed above in the Study Area and Methods section.

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES 1 AND 4

Management objectives 1 and 4 of the HCP require the maintenance of a minimum of 108 activity sites in the HCP area over the life of the permit, and at least 108 total activity sites in the twentieth year of the permit (2018). As noted above, the HCP management objectives apply to the 108 core sites, consisting of 80 Level 1 sites, and 28 Level 2 sites. Therefore, with the 108 core activity sites, management objectives 1 and 4 have been met for 2018 (Table 2).

In 2018 fifteen activity centers met the criteria for removal from the active GIS layer according to the Decision Tree for Removal of Activity Centers but have been retained (Appendix F).

Table 2. HCP northern spotted owl sites and occupancy status for 2018.

| Parameter Description | All Sites | Core Sites | Quadrat Sites |
|---|-----------|------------|---------------|
| A) HCP Occupied Sites | 126 | 108 | 29 |
| B) Occupied by Pairs | 80 | 76 | 18 |
| C) Occupied by Male | 24 | 17 | 3 |
| D) Occupied by Female | 14 | 8 | 5 |
| E) Occupied by Bird of unknown sex | 9 | 7 | 3 |
| F) Unoccupied (sites retained) | 92 | 21 | 29 |
| G) Unoccupied (sites removed) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| H) Total HCP Property Sites | 222 | 129 | 54 |
| Occupancy rate by pairs* (HCP §6.2.1.2 target = 80%) | N/A | 74% | 62% |

*Occupancy rate by pairs is determined by taking the number of sites occupied by pairs (B), and dividing it by the number of occupied sites: (A).

Core Sites include all Level 1 and Level 2 Sites.

The total number of HCP activity sites has remained relatively constant over the HCP years (Range 149-222, mean 192 (Figure 2). Only 149 activity sites were reported in the first year of HCP implementation (1999) when not all of the lands were surveyed. In 2000, several activity sites were included that were not occupied, were the result of take avoidance management prior to the HCP, and were subsequently removed from the inventory for 2001. It should be noted that not all Level 3 sites are surveyed for occupancy or non-occupancy every year, depending on which quadrats are being surveyed.

In 2018 there was only one new activity center located, and in 2017 there were three new sites located by THP surveys, quadrat surveys or incidental contacts. There was also one historic site that moved onto HRC property (the site was located off of HRC ownership in 2017). It is possible that the gradual increasing trend in spotted owl activity centers from 2008 – 2018 has been due to the movement of spotted owls as a result of increasing barred owl numbers, as well as the resulting barred owl influence on spotted owl activity centers.




Figure 2. Total NSO Activity Sites by HCP Year.

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE 2

Management objective 2 calls for maintenance of spotted owl pairs on an average of 80% of the core sites in the HCP area. During HCP development, 80% was selected as a target by taking the average number of occupied sites that contained pairs during the period of 1991 to 1998. As per HCP §6.2.3 # 6, the values pertaining to management objectives 2 and 3 are to be averaged over running five-year periods (see below). Site occupancy surveys verified pairs at 76 of the core 108 sites during the 2018 season (Table 2), giving an occupancy rate by pairs of 70% (0.7037). The five-year running average for the pair occupancy rate is 76.5% (Table 3).

To address the agreed-upon reporting components of the quadrat sampling approach, we also calculated the pair occupancy rate for all sites monitored in the quadrats, for comparison of results to the core sites. The pair occupancy rate for the 29 (occupied) activity sites within quadrats was 62%. For the quadrat sites, the five-year running average for the pair occupancy rate is 60% (Tables 2 and 4).

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE 3

Management objective 3 requires the maintenance of a five-year running average reproductive rate of at least 0.61 fledged young per pair for the core sites (for those pairs

monitored to determine reproductive output). For establishment of a target reproductive rate during HCP development, 0.61 was selected as a target by taking the average number of young fledged per pair during the period of 1994 to 1998. However, only pairs that were determined to be nesting, or confirmed by protocol visits to be non-nesting, were used in the calculation. Spotted owl pairs with “status unknown” are now also used in the equation.

During the 2018 breeding season, 76 pairs (of the 108 core sites) were monitored for nesting activity and reproductive output. Nesting activity was verified for 31 of the 76 pairs. A total of 36 young were fledged, resulting in a reproductive rate of 0.31 for the year. This results in a five-year running average reproductive rate for the twentieth year of the HCP to 0.44 (Table 3), which does not meet the target for management objective 3. Since the rolling five-year average target for reproductive rate has not been met during the years 2014 to 2018, the adaptive management measures of HCP § 6.2.3, #6 apply.

Table 3. Northern Spotted Owl Yearly Summary 2018.

| Owl Status | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Single Unk Sex | 8 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 7 |
| Single Male | 14 | 4 | 11 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 11 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 16 | 12 | 17 |
| Single Female | 4 | 8 | 11 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 12 | 10 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 13 | 11 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 8 |
| Pair Status Unknown | 39 | 38 | 42 | 38 | 38 | 45 | 47 | 21 | 30 | 44 | 51 | 49 | 52 | 50 | 42 | 26 | 36 | 41 |
| Non-nesting Pairs | 12 | 18 | 20 | 13 | 7 | 7 | 14 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 17 | 8 | 10 | 24 | 21 | 4 |
| Nesting Pair (failed) | 8 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 7 |
| Nesting Pair (PN) | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nesting Pair (PN1J) | 22 | 16 | 7 | 16 | 21 | 16 | 6 | 5 | 13 | 21 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 7 | 15 | 9 | 9 | 12 |
| Nesting Pair (PN2J) | 47 | 22 | 6 | 22 | 19 | 16 | 9 | 38 | 36 | 16 | 14 | 11 | 10 | 19 | 17 | 10 | 8 | 12 |
| Nesting Pair (PN3J) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Nesting Pairs | 71 | 43 | 14 | 38 | 41 | 35 | 15 | 50 | 52 | 43 | 21 | 21 | 15 | 33 | 39 | 25 | 23 | 31 |
| Total AC monitored (after 2003 only 108 "core sites" are monitored for reproductive and pair rate) | 156 | 114 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 |
| Total Owls | 405 | 275 | 212 | 262 | 258 | 246 | 210 | 278 | 280 | 254 | 232 | 221 | 219 | 244 | 248 | 212 | 210 | 220 |
| Pairs | 130 | 101 | 85 | 94 | 91 | 90 | 78 | 86 | 87 | 93 | 89 | 82 | 87 | 91 | 91 | 75 | 80 | 76 |
| Juveniles | 119 | 60 | 19 | 60 | 59 | 48 | 24 | 84 | 85 | 53 | 35 | 31 | 24 | 45 | 49 | 29 | 25 | 36 |
| Pair Occupancy Rate | 83.3% | 88.6% | 78.7% | 87.0% | 84.3% | 83.3% | 72.2% | 79.6% | 80.6% | 86.1% | 82.4% | 75.9% | 80.6% | 84.3% | 84.3% | 69.4% | 74.1% | 70.4% |
| Reproductive Rate | 0.92 | 0.59 | 0.22 | 0.64 | 0.65 | 0.53 | 0.31 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.57 | 0.39 | 0.38 | 0.28 | 0.49 | 0.54 | 0.39 | 0.31 | 0.47 |
| Rolling Average Occupancy Rate (5 Yr) | 83.3% | 88.6% | 79.6% | 82.3% | 84.4% | 84.4% | 81.1% | 81.3% | 80.0% | 80.4% | 80.2% | 80.9% | 81.1% | 81.9% | 81.5% | 78.9% | 78.5% | 76.5% |
| Rolling Average Reproductive Rate (5 Yr) | 0.92 | 0.59 | 0.64 | 0.65 | 0.60 | 0.53 | 0.47 | 0.62 | 0.69 | 0.67 | 0.64 | 0.66 | 0.52 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.41 | 0.40 | 0.44 |

Table 4. Northern Spotted Owl Yearly Quadrat Summary 2018.

| Owl Status | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Single Unk Sex | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| Single Male | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| Single Female | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Pair Status Unknown | 12 | 12 | 8 | 6 | 13 | 13 | 7 | 15 | 11 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 22 | 9 | 18 | 13 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 11 |
| Non-nesting Pairs | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 |
| Nesting Pair (failed) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Nesting Pairs | 12 | 10 | 18 | 10 | 7 | 12 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 17 | 19 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Total Number of Activity Sites | 34 | 31 | 36 | 22 | 37 | 38 | 20 | 28 | 22 | 33 | 42 | 24 | 40 | 27 | 35 | 39 | 29 | 30 | 34 | 29 |
| Total Number of Owls | 76 | 75 | 91 | 55 | 74 | 87 | 49 | 51 | 40 | 89 | 106 | 47 | 75 | 52 | 57 | 89 | 54 | 58 | 41 | 50 |
| Total Number of Pairs | 25 | 25 | 28 | 17 | 28 | 30 | 17 | 20 | 15 | 25 | 30 | 13 | 29 | 16 | 22 | 31 | 16 | 21 | 12 | 18 |
| Total Number of Juveniles | 17 | 19 | 27 | 16 | 9 | 19 | 12 | 3 | 3 | 31 | 34 | 10 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 19 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 3 |
| Pair Occupancy Rate | 73.5% | 80.6% | 77.8% | 77.3% | 75.7% | 78.9% | 85.0% | 71.4% | 68.2% | 75.8% | 71.4% | 54.2% | 72.5% | 59.3% | 62.9% | 79.5% | 55.2% | 70.0% | 35.3% | 62.1% |
| Reproductive Rate | 0.68 | 0.76 | 0.96 | 0.94 | 0.32 | 0.63 | 0.71 | 0.15 | 0.20 | 1.24 | 1.13 | 0.77 | 0.21 | 0.56 | 0.00 | 0.61 | 0.56 | 0.33 | 0.50 | 0.17 |
| Rolling Occupancy Rate (5 YR) | 73.5% | 80.6% | 77.8% | 77.3% | 77.0% | 78.1% | 78.9% | 77.7% | 75.8% | 75.9% | 74.4% | 68.2% | 68.4% | 66.6% | 64.0% | 65.7% | 65.9% | 65.4% | 60.6% | 60.4% |
| Rolling Reproductive Rate (5YR) | 0.68 | 0.76 | 0.96 | 0.94 | 0.73 | 0.72 | 0.71 | 0.55 | 0.40 | 0.59 | 0.69 | 0.70 | 0.71 | 0.78 | 0.53 | 0.43 | 0.39 | 0.41 | 0.40 | 0.44 |

In 2004 the Service clarified that the rolling averages, or running means, for pair occupancy and reproductive rates should be calculated by calculating a mean for each individual year, then calculating a mean of means, where $n = 5$ (Long 2004). This is the method used for Tables 3 and 4.

For the quadrat sites, including all the Level 1-3 sites in the quadrat monitoring units, and using the number of pairs monitored for reproduction ($n = 18$), the 2018 reproductive rate was 0.17 (Table 4). The five-year running average for reproductive rate among quadrat sites is 0.44 (Table 4). The core site average reproductive rate is typically greater than the quadrat site rate, as would be expected given the selection of the core sites based on assumed habitat quality and history of successful reproduction, although in 2018 the results were the same.

The NSOSRP recommended monitoring both the core sites and quadrat sites for occupancy and reproduction, and comparing the results to other study sites within the region. Because the HRC core sites and quadrat sites are managed in ways that are specific to the HCP, a comparison of trends in occupancy and reproduction with other study sites that are managed under different strategies (e.g., intensive timber harvest, moderate harvest, little to no harvest) can provide insight as to how the HCP is working and possibly what other factors may be affecting the spotted owl population (e.g., barred owls, climate). The available information indicates that trends for both the core and quadrat sites continue to track the results of other study areas over time (Figure 4).

Per HCP § 6.2.3, #3, management objectives may be modified if new information becomes available following review of the NSOSRP recommendations and approval by the USFWS and CDFW.

ACTIVITY SITE LEVELS OF PROTECTION

HCP §6.2.2 # 4, Conservation Measures, requires that owl activity sites on the covered lands be assigned to one of three protection levels. Accordingly, in September of 2018, 80 activity sites were designated as Level 1 sites. HRC requested an extension of the 1 June requirement for Level 1 selection due to the continuing difficulty of surveying all of the available sites by that date. The difficulty has increased in recent years due to the presence of barred owls in the study

area. USFWS and CDFW again granted HRC's request to extend the selection to 31 August to allow more time to visit the owl sites and provide greater flexibility in selection.

Selection of Level 1 sites was guided by the parameters described in HCP §6.2.2.4: 1) having the requisite habitat levels within a 0.7- and 1.3-mile radius of the activity center; and 2) having supported spotted owls in the previous year (2017), and also in the year selected (2018).

In addition, as part of the minor modifications approved in 2002, further language regarding Level 1 sites was added to management objective 2:

Maintain spotted owl pairs on an average of 80 percent (over a five-year period) of the minimum of 108 activity sites on the ownership (as shown in Table 7, for 2002 this minimum number shall be 115 activity sites, then 108 for 2003 and all subsequent years). At least 80 of these sites shall be Level One sites, and the balance shall be Level Two sites. PALCO intends to maintain these selected Level One and Level Two sites as the core sites for a period of from three to five years, or as long as possible, given other circumstances that may arise, and may preclude their maintenance as such. PALCO intends to select core sites that are historically stable, reproductively successful, and that have minimal disturbance, given that they occur in a managed landscape. (Emphasis added).

In keeping with the requirements of HCP §6.2.2 # 4 and # 5, if less than 500 acres of suitable habitat exists within 0.7 miles, or less than 1,336 acres of suitable habitat exists within 1.3 miles, the acreage of habitat cannot be reduced.

HRC is currently maintaining **101** Level One sites (83 Level One sites with an HRA and 18 replacement Level One sites, per the HRA language).

There is one replacement Level One activity center (site 72 in the Mattole River watershed) that is below the requisite 500 acres of suitable habitat within the 0.7-mile radius. However, no timber operations that could potentially reduce habitat quality are planned for this area, so habitat will not be reduced per the HCP. It appears that there are 50 or more acres of NRF habitat immediately adjacent to HRC property and within the 0.7 mile that is not currently typed as NSO habitat. Our GIS department is looking further into this issue and will update those areas with the appropriate NRF at a later date.

See the appendices for details and information on habitat acreage relative to Level 1 sites, THP activity, and quadrats (Appendices A-C).

Level 2 protection measures were afforded to 28 sites in 2018 (HCP §6.2.2.5). Level 2 sites receive 1,000-foot buffers during the breeding season. After the breeding season, or if a non-nesting status is determined, harvest may occur around a Level 2 activity site, as long as an 18-acre core area (the equivalent area of a 500-foot radius circle), with at least a 400-foot radius consisting of the best available habitat, is retained.

As with the Level 1 sites, as part of the minor modifications approved in 2002, further language regarding Level 2 sites was added to HCP §6.2.2 # 5, bullet # 4:

By 1 September of each year, PALCO shall designate the necessary number of Level Two sites, to make up the minimum number of activity sites as shown in Table 7.

Accordingly, in late August we designated 28 Level 2 sites, which combined with the 80 Level One sites already designated made up the 108 core sites for 2018.

Level 3 protection was afforded the balance of the activity sites on the HCP covered lands in 2018 (HCP §6.2.2 # 6). Level 3 sites are those sites not needed to meet management objectives 1 or 4 (108 minimum activity sites). As with Level 2 sites, Level 3 sites receive 1,000-foot buffers during the breeding season.

Language was also added (in 2002) to HCP §6.2.2 # 6 regarding Level 3 sites:

During the breeding season, for activity sites which have been determined to be occupied by a non-nesting pair or single NSO, 18 acres around the activity site shall be maintained as suitable nesting habitat, if present. The protected 18 acres may conform to natural landscape features, as designated by PALCO's wildlife biologist or a designee, and the buffer protecting the activity site must have at least a 400 foot radius. At PALCO's discretion harvesting may occur during the breeding season, in the area adjoining the 18-acre habitat retention area.

Thus, if a non-nesting status is determined, harvest may occur around a Level 3 activity site, so long as an 18-acre core area (the equivalent area of a 500-foot radius circle), with at least a 400-foot radius is retained. After the breeding season, harvest of the Level 3 sites may occur. If the activity site is harvested, any known nest trees are to be retained.

Habitat Conditions

The amount and type of spotted owl habitat as per HCP §6.2, Table 6 is reported annually (Table 5). Habitat information from the HRC Geographic Information System (GIS) is a “snapshot in time” of habitat conditions. For consistency and coordination with other forest inventory requirements the snapshot is currently taken on or around 1 January each year (Map 3). Thus, the information contained in this section of the report represents habitat conditions from approximately 1 January 2018 to 1 January 2019.

As discussed in previous NSO annual reports, annual reports from 1999-2009 utilized forest stand information from 1999 and previous years to generate Wildlife Habitat Relationship (WHR) types and thus nesting, roosting and foraging (NRF) types based on HCP Table 6. Beginning in 2010 HRC embarked on a re-inventory project of the entire 209,000 acres of HRC lands. For the 2010 through 2012 habitat reports we included the most current forest inventory information resulting from 2002-2006 cruise information, harvest updates for each year from 2000 forward, and cruise information available to date from the re-inventory work. This information was the most current and reliable “stand” information and best reflected conditions on the ground, although field evaluations were occasionally needed to verify stand types.

Also noted in previous year’s reports, HRC has revised procedures for assigning and tracking WHR and NRF types. Under the current procedures, WHR types are generated directly from tree data collected in HRC’s current forest resource inventory; whereas under PALCO, WHR was a static property-wide GIS layer that was usually, but not always, updated for harvests and had not been grown forward since its creation in 1999.

The re-inventory project has been completed for all HRC lands. HRC uses FORSEE software – developed by the California Growth and Yield Modeling cooperative of private and agency organizations – to process field inventory data. To generate WHR habitat types HRC uses output from FORSEE (modeled crown widths and WHR habitat species calls) together with methodology consistent with procedures used for PALCO’s 1999 HCP to develop WHR size classes. In future years these procedures will continue to be implemented on the current field inventory data set, which will be updated annually with new/replacement field plots, growth of

trees in existing plot data via FORSEE, and changes in timber types resulting from harvest and growth.

The current inventory information has been applied to both the property-wide analysis of habitat (Table 5, Figure 3) and the 0.7 and 1.3 mile habitat radii pertaining to the Level 1 activity sites (Appendix C). A change in habitat trends corresponding with change in ownership, silviculture, and harvest level can be seen beginning around 2009. The steady, anticipated trend of reduction in nesting habitat, resulting in part due to the even-age silviculture preferred by the previous landowner, has leveled out in recent years. Similarly, the observed recent decline in the previously increasing number of acres of non-habitat is also consistent with the change to uneven-age management, with a concurrent increase in foraging habitat post-harvest. An increase in nesting habitat since our last report is attributed primarily to growth.

Similar to previous annual reports, an analysis of patch sizes of suitable nesting habitat has been conducted on both the 18-acre and 80-acre polygon size, and included with this report (Table 5). The inventory changes discussed above also resulted in a change in the number of habitat patches. The acres of habitat in the Grizzly Creek Complex and Owl Creek MMCA are shown separately due to the unique nature of these parcels. No new inventory information has been applied to these parcels, although it is reasonable to assume that young stands in these reserves are growing and potentially increasing in habitat value for spotted owls.

Table 5. Acres of Habitat and Nesting Habitat Patches.

| Year | Nesting (Acres) | Roosting (Acres) | Foraging (Acres) | Non Habitat (Acres) | 18+ Acre Patches (Nesting) | 80+ Acre Patches (Nesting) |
|--------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 1999 | 87,416 | 35,343 | 40,780 | 45,142 | 199 | 64 |
| 2000 | 82,205 | 36,670 | 40,753 | 49,053 | 204 | 68 |
| 2001 | 76,799 | 37,416 | 40,608 | 53,858 | 214 | 62 |
| 2002 | 70,309 | 38,209 | 39,642 | 60,521 | 226 | 72 |
| 2003 | 65,984 | 38,289 | 39,538 | 64,870 | 231 | 79 |
| 2004 | 63,153 | 38,641 | 40,103 | 66,784 | 238 | 83 |
| 2005 | 60,927 | 39,557 | 40,307 | 70,442 | 241 | 93 |
| 2006 | 58,453 | 39,043 | 39,533 | 74,204 | 244 | 92 |
| 2007 | 56,386 | 37,390 | 39,010 | 78,431 | 250 | 87 |
| 2008 | 55,412 | 37,747 | 39,890 | 77,886 | 251 | 88 |
| 2009 | 54,402 | 59,036 | 28,094 | 68,130 | 348 | 101 |
| 2010 | 60,348 | 46,372 | 36,236 | 66,300 | 332 | 105 |
| 2011 | 55,758 | 56,063 | 43,589 | 53,869 | 366 | 118 |
| 2012 | 61,817 | 60,424 | 43,330 | 43,708 | 311 | 102 |
| 2013 | 57,171 | 52,842 | 68,177 | 31,073 | 421 | 128 |
| 2014 | 54,909 | 55,514 | 68,177 | 30,625 | 424 | 125 |
| 2015 | 53,106 | 58,642 | 68,302 | 29,227 | 426 | 123 |
| 2016 | 51,429 | 57,133 | 71,382 | 29,399 | 422 | 120 |
| 2017 | 50,491 | 60,427 | 71,980 | 26,445 | 431 | 127 |
| 2018 | 51,767 | 57,775 | 76,276 | 23,632 | 418 | 117 |
| Grizzly_Owl | 1,700 | 207 | 322 | 343 | 4 | 4 |




Figure 3. Northern spotted owl habitat types on HRC lands 1999-2018.

To put habitat growth and harvest on HRC lands in the context of regional habitat conditions within the range of the northern spotted owl, we've previously reviewed the Final and Revised Final Recovery Plans for the Northern Spotted Owl (USFWS 2008, 2011b). The USFWS (2008) reported on the loss of spotted owl habitat range-wide related to timber harvest and natural events. Specifically related to timber harvest, they cautioned readers that harvest estimates can only be used to infer rates of forest removal, and may or may not translate directly to a rate of suitable habitat loss, since not all forest may equate to suitable spotted owl habitat.

Relative to the loss of suitable habitat due to **timber harvest**, USFWS (2008, 2011b) noted that there are only a few available reports on the topic, and summarized them as follows:

Cohen et al. (2002) cited in Bigley and Franklin (2004) reported "a steep decline in harvest rates between the late 1980's and early 1990's on State and Federal and private industrial forestlands." Habitat trends reported by the Service (USFWS 2004) indicated an overall decline of about 2% in the amount of suitable habitat on Federal lands as a result of management activities from 1994

to 2003. This rate is lower than the 2.5% per decade estimate of habitat loss resulting from management activities that was predicted in the Northwest Forest Plan (USDA and USDI 1994). Cohen et al. (2002) reported that from the early 1970's through the mid-1990's the harvest rates on private industrial forest lands were consistently about twice the average harvest rate on public lands.

Raphael (2006) estimated that since 1994, losses of NSO habitat from non-federal timber harvest have exceeded losses from Federal land, with a range-wide loss of approximately 8.0% (12% in Washington, 10.7% in Oregon, and 2.2% in California). Raphael (2006) also conducted an analysis looking only at regeneration harvest. This analysis estimates that nearly 3,000 acres of higher suitability spotted owl habitat was harvested on Federal reserved lands, and about 26,000 acres on non-reserved lands, between 1994 and 2004. This harvest represents less than 1% of the approximately 10 million acres of high suitability habitat thought to exist on both Federal and non-federal land in 1994.

Davis and Dugger (2011) estimated the amount of spotted owl nesting and roosting habitat lost due to harvest from the start of the Northwest Forest Plan (1994/1996) to 2006/2007 on non-federal lands in California to be about 90,200 acres (5.8% of total). However, Davis and Lint (2005) found that forest fragmentation in California *decreased* from the 1930's and 1940's to the current time, possibly due to fire suppression.

Regarding habitat loss from **natural events** the USFWS (2008) reported that the loss of spotted owl habitat from natural events during the 10-year period from 1994 to 2003 was 224,041 acres, or about a 3% decline in available habitat range-wide (USFWS 2004). The majority of the habitat loss was due to wildfire (75%) with insects and disease making up the remainder (25%). Approximately 7,500 acres (0.4%) in California were estimated to have been lost due to fire, insects and disease from (1994/1996) to 2006/2007 (Davis and Dugger 2011).

More recently, for private industrial forest lands in California within the range of the northern spotted owl that do not operate under a HCP, there have been changes in take avoidance measures that require more habitat to be retained adjacent to activity sites (e.g. USFWS 2011).

BANDING PROGRAM

Banding of spotted owls as part of our overall program is a long-term research and management tool to help monitor the spotted owl population on the HRC ownership. The primary purposes of the banding and re-sighting project include: defining stable activity sites (site fidelity and displacement); detection of changes in occupancy over time (turnover and replacement); documentation of movements of sites and nest areas; and assessment of habitat quality based on site occupancy and reproductive history.

We again request that the USFWS consider this report, with associated Map 1, to satisfy their request for information concerning HRC's banding program as discussed in their letter of 14 January 2004.

In 2018, there were 108 total band resights (Appendix H). Of the 108 core sites, 30 pairs were positively identified at occupied sites. Since 2003 a total of 384 spotted owls have been banded, consisting of 333 adults and 51 juveniles. Data from HRC banded northern spotted owls with at least seven years of data (131 banded adults from 60 sites during the years 2000-2006) showed that spotted owl survival remained stable over that time period (Bigger et al. 2008). Continuing to collect and analyze banding and re-sight information is a key component of this program.

REGIONAL TRENDS

Following both the 2003 and 2007 survey seasons, PALCO, the NSOSRP, and the Agencies convened and discussed the HCP management objectives, potential reasons why they may not be met, and potential corrective measures to implement if necessary. On both occasions the NSOSRP recommended that HCP results be compared to those of other study areas in the region. Figure 4 below illustrates the regional northern spotted owl reproductive rates for several study areas of Northern California (Douglas, Early, Fullerton, Higley, Carlson, pers. comm. 2018).

As demonstrated in the figure, results for both the core and quadrat sites on HRC track the results of other study areas over the HCP period, with the exception of the Willow Creek Study Area (WCSA) for which positive or negative changes sometimes seem to “lag” a year or two behind other study areas. As with other studies in the region (Anthony, et al 2004, Franklin 1997, Franklin 2000) data indicates that reproductive results are strongly correlated to regional trends

in climate (Franklin, et al. 2000, HRC, unpublished data). Glenn (2009) found that climate accounted for 78-84% of the temporal variation in population change in the Oregon coast range, and climate and barred owls together accounted for approximately 100% of the changes in spotted owl survival. Thus, there are good and bad reproductive years that appear to track precipitation early in the breeding season, and more recently, the barred owl influence on spotted owl reproduction.

All the five cooperators reported mixed reproductive results for 2018. Typically, lower than average rainfall events of late spring results in higher than average reproduction.




Figure 4. Comparison of Regional Reproductive Rates 2000-2018.

RECOMMENDATIONS

SURVEYS

Current plans call for continued surveys in 2019 for THPs and for monitoring with the quadrat sampling strategy. In 2019, quadrats 3, 13, 18, and 20 are scheduled for monitoring (Lower Eel River, Long Ridge, Lawrence Creek and Grizzly Creek, respectively). These quadrats were initially surveyed in 2004, 2009 and again in 2014, and it will be interesting to compare them

with the 2019 surveys, distribution of activity centers, reproduction, and location and activity level of barred owls. Timely follow-up visits (i.e., within 72 hours, weather permitting) will be conducted to all nighttime contacts. Following the season, the data gathered will be used to evaluate the efficacy of the HCP management objectives and conservation measures for the core sites, and also for the quadrat sites.

BANDING

In 2019 we intend to continue to work with the Service, CDFW, and adjacent study areas to make our banding efforts as efficient and effective as possible, keeping in mind the goals of the effort. The overall intent is to utilize the program as a complete mark and re-sight effort and to develop programs similar to other study sites in the region. As always, during any of our capture and banding efforts, we will continue to be cautious in our efforts, keeping the care and safety of the birds first in mind.

BARRED OWLS

HRC continues to have significant concerns that the barred owl invasion will continue to cause declines in site occupancy and reproduction of our spotted owl population. In 2015, we suspended the use of barred owl calls (5 minutes of recorded barred owl calls at the end of the 10 minute spotted owl calls) on all of our quadrat monitoring stations. We intend to revisit the use of barred owl calls in light of any new information that becomes available. We will attempt to utilize any new techniques to monitor barred owl and spotted owls across the ownership. In addition, HRC continues to be interested in the results of barred owl removal projects as recommended by the Service (USFWS 2008), and will continue to monitor the results of ongoing studies as they are available.

SCIENTIFIC PANEL/MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES

The HCP Northern Spotted Owl Conservation Plan §6.2.2, Conservation Measures, Item 1 refers to the NSO Scientific Review Panel (NSOSRP) and discusses the establishment and roles of the NSOSRP. The NSOSRP generally met every year for the first 5-6 years of implementation and provided review of monitoring results and recommendations for future monitoring and analyses.

Not meeting the HCP management objectives for pair occupancy and/or reproductive rate triggers the adaptive management measures of HCP § 6.2.3, #6, and a discussion between HRC, USFWS, CDFW, and the Panel shall occur to review potential reasons why the objective is not being met, and potential corrective measures to implement.

As stated earlier, during the period of 2014 - 2018 the rolling five-year average reproductive rate for monitored pairs of northern spotted owls in our study area has not met the HCP objective of 0.61 fledglings per pair. The rolling average reproductive rates for 2014- 2018 were, 0.42, 0.42, 0.41, 0.40 and 0.44 respectively, and follow a period of five consecutive years (2008-2012) when the rolling average reproductive rate *did* meet the management objective.

During the 20 years of HCP implementation (1999-2018) the management objective for the rolling average reproductive rate was not met during the 2006 and 2007 seasons (0.53 and 0.47 respectively). And, similar to the 2013-2018 period, followed seven consecutive years when the rolling average was greater than 0.61, or not significantly different from 0.61 (e.g. 0.59, 2002).

Following the 2007 season the HRC, USFWS, CDFW, and Panel (Alan Franklin, Barry Noon, and Steven Courtney) convened via conference call to discuss the reproductive results. Consideration was given to whether there was a clear cause-and-effect relationship between management activities, or if results were within the range of annual variation.

At that time the forestlands were still owned by the Pacific Lumber Company and managed using primarily even-age (clear cut) management at a rate of harvest of approximately 150 mmbf/year, including harvest of old growth trees. The barred owl invasion of north coastal California had not yet been fully realized as a potential reason for a reduced reproductive rate.

Although there were no clear reasons for a reduced reproductive rate, for discussion on the conference call a Habitat Retention Area (HRA) strategy was proposed as a potential corrective measure, with the objective of retaining a polygon of the best habitat surrounding the most stable and reproductive spotted owl nest sites, rather than using the 500' and 1,000' radii as the standard habitat retention model. The USFWS, CDFW, Panel and HRC agreed on the strategy, and it was implemented beginning in 2009 (CDFG and USFWS 2009).

In 2008 the Humboldt Redwood Company (HRC) was formed from the Pacific Lumber Company bankruptcy proceedings and significant management changes followed, including in harvest techniques, rate of harvest, and retention of old growth components. Management of the Humboldt County forestlands was changed to reflect that of HRC's sister company, Mendocino Redwood Company (MRC), including the use of uneven-age (selection, group selection) harvest, a reduction in harvest level to an average of approximately 55 mmbf/year (over a ten-year period), and retention of all old growth trees meeting the company policy.

In 2008 and 2009 the annual reproductive rate was relatively high (0.98 both years) but has since declined from 2010-2018, and as the high rates have fallen out of the rolling average calculation and been replaced by lower rates, the rolling average has also declined to the point where it is below the management objective. So, although management on the forestlands has changed in a manner that results in harvest of less spotted owl habitat (i.e. Figure 3), and retains more late successional habitat components on the landscape, the reproductive rate is in a current decline nonetheless.

Similar to other study sites in the region, HRC has tracked the presence of barred owls in our study area. There has been an overall increase over time in barred owl detections within 0.5-mile of spotted owl activity sites (Figure 1). Studies previously referenced have indicated that barred owl presence within spotted owl territories can disrupt spotted owl occupancy and reproduction.

During the HCP's early years the Panel recommended comparing the HRC HCP results to other study sites within the region. Because the HRC owl sites are managed in ways that are specific to the HCP, a comparison of trends in occupancy and reproduction with other study sites that are managed under different strategies (e.g., intensive timber harvest, moderate harvest, little to no harvest) can provide insight as to how the HCP is working and possibly what other factors may be affecting the spotted owl population (e.g., barred owls, climate). The available information indicates that trends for both the core and quadrat sites continue to track the results of other study areas over time (Figure 4).

Most cooperators reported poor to slightly below average breeding activity and reproductive rates in 2018, and there appears to be a declining trend unlike the "every other" year pattern, or weather-influenced effect on spotted owl reproduction that had been historically observed. It

should also be noted that increases in spotted owl occupancy and reproduction on the Hoopa and Green Diamond study areas have been at least in part attributed to lethal barred owl removal from spotted owl territories. 2017 was the lowest rate for the last three years for HRC as the reproductive rate was 0.31, and along with the 2016 rate of 0.39 and the 2015 rate of 0.54, represents a similar trend of below average rates (for our study area) for the past five years.

In light of the fact that management of the HRC forestlands has had a reduced impact on habitat since the change in ownership in 2008, the evidence from other study areas within the range of the northern spotted owl that barred owls can have a significant impact on occupancy and reproduction of spotted owls, and the fact that HRC activity centers have been colonized by barred owls, it seems to be clear that barred owls are now negatively impacting spotted owl occupancy and reproduction on HRC lands and are the primary cause of failure to meet HCP management objectives.

Another potential factor in declining spotted owl reproduction on HRC lands is a decline in prey base (e.g. dusky-footed woodrats) as a result of the change in silvicultural practice from even to uneven-age, in turn resulting in a decrease in brushy clearings favored by woodrats. Future prey base studies should focus on woodrat densities in selection, group selection, and variable retention harvest areas compared to clear cut harvest.

We anticipate that these topics would be the primary focus of any future discussion of HCP management objectives and potential corrective measures, pursuant to HCP § 6.2.3, #6.

REFERENCES

- Anthony, R.G., Eric D. Forsman, Alan B. Franklin, David R. Anderson, Kenneth P. Burnham, Gary C. White, Carl J. Schwarz, Jim Nichols, Jim E. Hines, Gail S. Olson, Steven H. Ackers, Steve Andrews, Brian L. Biswell, Peter C. Carlson, Lowell V. Diller, Katie M. Dugger, Katherine E. Fehring, Tracy L. Fleming, Richard P. Gerhardt, Scott A. Gremel, R.J. Gutierrez, Patti J. Happe, Dale R. Herter, J. Mark Higley, Rob. B. Horn, Larry L. Irwin, Peter J. Loschl, Janice A. Reid, and Stan G. Sovern. 2004. Status and Trends in Demography of Northern Spotted Owls, 1985-2003. Report for the Interagency Regional Monitoring Program. 179 pp.
- Bigger, D., K. Sullivan, and S. Chinnici. 2008. Modeling reproductive performance of northern spotted owls relative to climate and forest habitat in coastal California. Presentation at the Annual Meeting of The Wildlife Society, Miami, Florida.
- Bigley, R. and J. Franklin. 2004. Habitat trends. Chapter 6 in S. Courtney (editor), Scientific evaluation of the status of the northern spotted owl. Sustainable Ecosystems Institute, Portland, Oregon.
- Blakesley, J.A., W. LaHaye, J.M.M. Marzluff, B.R. Noon, and S. Courtney. 2004. Demography. Chapter 8 in S. Courtney, editor. Scientific evaluation of the status of the northern spotted owl. Sustainable Ecosystems Institute, Portland, Oregon.
- California Department of Fish and Game. 2009. Concurrence on Habitat Retention Area Strategy for Level One Northern Spotted Owl Activity Centers, Humboldt Redwood Company Habitat Conservation Plan Section 6.2.2.4 Bullet # 6. Letter from CDFG to Humboldt Redwood Company, March 3, 2009.
- Carlson, P. 2017. Personal communication between Peter Carlson, Research Associate, Colorado State University, and Brad Mauney, Lead Wildlife Biologist at HRC.
- Cohen, W.B., T.A. Spies, R.J. Alig, D.R. Oetter, T.K. Maiersperger, and M. Fiorella. 2002. Characterizing 23 years (1972-1995) of stand replacement disturbance in western Oregon forests with Landsat Imagery. *Ecosystems* 5:122-137.
- Courtney, Steven P., Jennifer A. Blakesley, Richard E. Bigley, Martin L. Cody, Jack P. Dumbacher, Robert C. Fleischer, Alan B. Franklin, Jerry F. Franklin, Rocky J. Gutierrez, John M. Marzluff, and Lisa Sztukowski. 2004. Scientific Evaluation of the Status of the Northern Spotted Owl. Report to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in Support of the 5-Year Status Review Process.
- Courtney, S.P., A.B. Carey, M.L. Cody, K. Engel, K.E. Fehring, J.F. Franklin, M.R. Fuller, R.J. Gutierrez, J.F. Lehmkuhl, M.A. Hemstrom, P.F. Hessburg, S.L. Stephens, L.A. Sztukowski, L. Young. 2008. Scientific Review of the Draft Northern Spotted Owl Recovery Plan and Reviewer Comments. Sustainable Ecosystems Institute. Portland, OR. 159 pp.
- Davis, R.J., and K.M. Dugger. 2011. Northwest forest plan-the first 15 years (1994-2008): status and trends of Northern Spotted Owl Populations and Habitat. General Technical Report PNW- GTR-850. Pacific Northwest Research Station, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Portland, Oregon.
- Davis, R., and J. Lint. 2005. Habitat status and trends. Pages 21-82 in J. Lint, technical coordinator. Northwest Forest Plan—the first 10 years (1994-2003): status and trends of northern spotted owl populations and habitat. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-648, Pacific Northwest Research Station, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Portland, Oregon.

- Diller, L.V., K.A. Hamm, D.A. Early, D.W. Lamphear, K.M. Dugger, C.B. Yackulic, C.J. Schwarz, P.C. Carlson, and T.L. McDonald. Demographic Response of Northern Spotted Owls to Barred Owl Removal. *Journal of Wildlife Management*; DOI: 10.1002/jwmg.1046.
- Douglas, R. 2017. Personal communication between Robert Douglas, Forest Sciences Manager at Mendocino Redwood Company (MRC) and Brad Mauney, Lead Wildlife Biologist at HRC.
- K.M. Dugger, E.D. Forsman, A.B. Franklin, R.J. Davis, G.C. White, C.J. Schwarz, K.P. Burnham, J.D. Nichols, J.E. Hines, C.B. Yackulic, P.F. Doherty, Jr., L.Bailey, D.A. Clark, S.H. Ackers, L.S. Andrews, B. Augustine, B.L. Biswell, J. Blakesley, P.C. Carlson, M.J. Clement, L.V. Diller, E. M. Glenn, A. Green, S.A. Gremel, D.R. Herter, J.M. Higley, J. Hobson, R.B. Horn, K.P. Huyvaert, C. McCafferty, T. McDonald, K. McDonnell, G.S. Olson, J.A. Reid, J. Rockweit, V. Ruiz, J. Saenz, and S.G. Sovern. 2016. The effects of habitat, climate, and Barred Owls on long-term demography of Northern Spotted Owls. *The Condor: Ornithological Applications* 118: 57-116.
- Early, D. 2017. Personal communication between Desiree Early, Wildlife Biologist at Green Diamond Resource Company and Brad Mauney, Lead Wildlife Biologist at HRC.
- Franklin, A. 1997. Factors Affecting Temporal and Spatial Variation in Northern Spotted Owl Populations in Northwest California. PhD. Dissertation, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado. 185 pp.
- Franklin, A.B., D.R. Anderson, R.J. Gutierrez, and K.P. Burnham. 2000. Climate, habitat quality, and fitness in northern spotted owl populations in northwestern California. *Ecological Monographs* 70:539-590.
- Fullerton, S. 2017. Personal communication between Scott Fullerton, Wildlife Biologist for Lyme Timberland Management, and Brad Mauney, Lead Wildlife Biologist at HRC.
- Glenn, E.M. 2009. Local weather, regional climate, and population dynamics of northern spotted owls in Washington and Oregon. Dissertation, Oregon State University, Corvallis.
- Green Diamond Resource Company. 2014. HCP Annual Report. Available on the website greendiamond.com.
- Higley, J.M. 2017. Personal communication between J. Mark Higley, Senior Biologist for Hoopa Tribal Forestry, and Brad Mauney, Lead Wildlife Biologist at HRC.
- Irwin, L., D. Rock, and S. Rock. 2015. Resource Partitioning in California Coast Redwood Forests: Hope for Spotted Owls? Final Report. National Council for Air and Stream Improvement. 48 pp.
- Long, M. 2004. Letter from Michael Long, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to J. Barrett, Scotia Pacific Lumber LLC. April, 21, 2004. Review of the 2003 Northern Spotted Owl Annual Report of The Pacific Lumber Company (AFWO File Number 1-14-TA-2004-2190). 2 pp.
- Raphael, M.G. 2006. Conservation of listed species: the northern spotted owl and marbled murrelet. Chapter 7 in R.W. Haynes, B.T. Borman, D.C. Lee, and J.R. Martin (technical editors), *Northwest Forest Plan – the first 10 years (1994-2003): synthesis of monitoring, and research results*. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, Oregon.
- The Pacific Lumber Company. 1999. Habitat Conservation Plan for the Properties of The Pacific Lumber Company, Scotia Pacific Holding Co., and Salmon Creek Corporation.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture and U.S. Department of the Interior. 1994. Record of decision for amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management planning documents within the range of the northern spotted owl; standards and guidelines for management of habitat for late-

- successional and old growth forest related species within the range of the northern spotted owl
USDA Forest Service, Portland, Oregon, and USDI Bureau of Land Management, Portland,
Oregon.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. 2004. Estimate Trends in Suitable Habitat for the Northern Spotted Owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*) on Federal Lands from 1994 to 2003. For Use By: Sustainable Ecosystems Institute for the Northern Spotted Owl 5-Year Review. U.S.D.I. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1992. Protocol for surveying proposed management activities that may impact northern spotted owls. March 7, 1991 (Revised March 17, 1992).
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. 1999. Biological and Conference Opinions Regarding Issuance of an Incidental Take Permit to the Pacific Lumber Company, Scotia Pacific Company LLC, and Salmon Creek Corporation. 469 pp. and Appendices.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2008. Final Recovery Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl, *Strix occidentalis caurina*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon. xii + 142 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2009. Response to Proposal for a Habitat Retention Areas Strategy for Level 1 Northern Spotted Owls. Letter from USFWS to Humboldt Redwood Company, February 25, 2009.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2010. Draft revised recovery plan for the northern spotted owl, *Strix occidentalis caurina*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon. xii + 163 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2011a. Revised Survey Protocol for the Northern Spotted Owl, (*Strix occidentalis caurina*). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2011b. Revised Recovery Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl, (*Strix occidentalis caurina*). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon. Xvi + 258 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2011. 2011 Revision of the Northern Spotted Owl Take Avoidance Analysis and Guidance for California Coast Forest District. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata, CA. 12 pp.
- Wiens, David J., Katie M. Dugger, Damon Lesmeister, Krista E. Dilione, David C. Simon, and Robin Bown. 2017. Status of Spotted Owls, Barred Owls, and Removal Experiments in Oregon and Washington. Abstract of presentation at The Western Section of the Wildlife Society Conference. Santa Rosa, CA.
- Wiens, J.D., Dugger, K.M., Lesmeister, D.B., Dilione, K.E., and Simon, D.C.. 2018. Effects of experimental removal of Barred Owls on population demography of Northern Spotted Owls in Washington and Oregon-2017 progress report: U.S. Geologic Survey Open-File Report 2018-1086, 23 p., <https://doi.org/10.3133/ofr20181086>.