Monitoring for Marbled Murrelet and Northern Spotted Owl at Naval Radio Station Jim Creek with Implications for Future Marbled Murrelet Surveys

Adam Duarte¹, Alicia M. Higgs², Alaina D. Thomas¹, Damon B. Lesmesister¹

1. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station

2. Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command, Naval Station Everett





DoD Natural Resources Management Program

- Sikes Act the conservation and rehabilitation of natural resources on military installations
- Requires Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP)







DoD Natural Resources Management Program

Marbled Murrelet (MAMU) Brachyramphus marmoratus ESA threatened



Northern Spotted Owl (NSO) Strix occidentalis caurina ESA threatened



Study Area: NRS(T) Jim Creek



- Very low frequency radio transmitter
- Recreation area
- Old-growth forest conservation area



Study Objectives

- Determine NSO and MAMU status
- Compare detectability
 of MAMU
 - Standard AV surveys
 - Passive acoustic monitoring





Passive Acoustic Surveys





- Pros:
 - Detect whole suite of vocalizing species
 - Permanent record
 - Monitor many sites at once over longer periods
 - Detect rare or cryptic vocalizing species
- Cons:
 - Storing, processing, validating many hours of sound data
 - At mercy of technology



- Pros
 - Detect vocalizations and flight behavior for MAMU
- Cons
 - Navigate to site in dark, early mornings
 - At mercy of weather and technician availability, ID skill, and attention span



Survey Design

Passive Acoustic

- Within 10m of the audio-visual survey station
- Throughout study area
- 39 total stations

Audio-visual Surveys

- Pacific Seabird Group (inland forest survey protocol)
- 19 stations throughout quality MAMU nesting habitat



Survey Design



Audio Data Analyses

PNW C-net v4

- Prediction thresholds
 - ≥0.95 for MAMU keer calls
 - ≥0.25 for NSO location calls





Results

Passive Acoustic



- 39 total stations
- Aimed for 6 week deployments
 - Days fully operational averaged 46.7 (range: 13–64)
 - Recorded 1,840,970.24 total hours
 - Range across stations: 133.00–664.86 hours
 - Approximately 4.74 Tb of audio data
- No detections of NSO
 - BADO detected at 38 stations
- MAMU detected at 24 stations
 - 573 total detections

Audio-visual Surveys



- 19 total stations
- Replicate surveys
 - 70 total surveys
 - 2–5 replicate surveys per station (avg. = 3.68)
- MAMU detected at 10 stations
 - 88 total detections

Passive Acoustic MAMU Detections





Audio-visual Survey MAMU Detections



Laurel Mundy

88 total detections across 10 stations

- 69 were auditory
- Visual detections
 - 4 flying over the canopy
 - 1 circling over the canopy
 - 8 circling at or below canopy
 - 6 flying through at or below canopy

Comparing MAMU Detections

- AV surveys
 - MAMU status
 - 4 stations MAMU Occupied
 - 6 stations MAMU Present
 - 9 stations MAMU Not Detected
 - Missed 7 <u>at least</u> MAMU
 Present

- Passive acoustic
 - Never missed MAMU
 Occupied
 - Missed 3 MAMU Present





| | | Detected | Not detected |
|--|--------------|----------|--------------|
| | Detected | 7 | 7 |
| | Not detected | 3 | 2 |

Implications for Future MAMU Surveys



^{*}Preliminary results, subject to change

Management Implications

- Ensure Navy activities are implementing minimization measures
 - esp near MAMU hotspots
- Habitat enhancement through forestry projects
- Contribute to advancing science and conservation of this species



Thank you!

Mapping, field support, surveyors, and validation:

Juliana JenkinsBSean GeeToNicole MutchlerJaNatalie Rugg

Bryan Begay Tom Munger Jacob Schmidt









Questions/Comments?

Adam Duarte Email: adam.duarte@usda.gov

Alicia Higgs Email: alicia.m.higgs.civ@us.navy.mil