


PROCEEDINGS

OF THE 31st ANNUAL MEETING

THE MONTANA CHAPTER



GREAT FALLS, MONTANA - FEBRUARY 24-26, 1993

FORWARD

The 1993 annual meeting of the Montana Chapter of the Wildlife Society was held 24-26 February at the Sheraton Hotel in Great Falls. This meeting was held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the Montana Chapter of the American Fisheries Society. This was the first time that the two societies had met together in over a decade.

The first day of the conference was devoted to concurrent sessions from both societies consisting of papers and panel discussions. In addition to the papers that follow, a panel discussion titled "The Future of Game Ranching" occurred during the afternoon. Panel members included: Heidi Youmans (Montana Dept. Fish, Wildlife, and Parks), Dr. Don Ferlicka (Montana Dept. of Livestock), Les Graham (Executive Secretary of the Montana Game Breeders Association), and Joe Gutkoski (Montana Wildlife Federation).

The second day included a morning plenary session with keynote addresses provided by Glen Marx (Natural Resource Aide to Governor Racicot) and Pat Graham (Director Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks). Legislative updates were given by Stan Bradshaw (Lobbyist, Trout Unlimited), Jim Richards (Lobbyist, Montana Wildlife Federation), Bob Ream (Legislator, House of Representatives), and Don Bianchi (Legislator, Senate).

In the afternoon a panel discussion entitled "Elk Management in the 90's - Shifty Paradigms?" was held. Panelists included: Mike Hillis (Lolo National Forest), Dave McCleery (Bureau of Land Management), Mike Thompson (Montana Dept. Fish, Wildlife, and Parks), Greg Watson (Plum Creek Timber Co.), and Alan Wood (Montana Dept. of State Lands).

The Wildlife Society Business Meeting was held during the afternoon prior to the joint evening banquet. The Distinguished Service award was presented to L. Jack Lyon and the Bob Watts Communications Award was presented to Craig and Pam Knowles. Kevin Podruzny (MSU) and Denali Henderson (UM) were recipients of the Wynn Freeman Scholarships.

The final day was devoted to papers during the morning with the session closing with an address from Hal Salwasser National President-Elect of The Wildlife Society.

Special thanks are due Harvey Nyberg, Randy Matchett, Marilyn Wood, and Tim Thier for their services as session chairpersons and to Gary Dusek and Les Marcum as panel moderators. These proceedings were compiled and edited by Wayne Kasworm.

| TABLE OF CONTENTS | PAGE |
|--|------|
| MONTANA CHAPTER, TWS OFFICERS..... | 4 |
| MONTANA CHAPTER, TWS AWARDS..... | 5 |
| WYNN FREEMAN SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS..... | 6 |
| PAPERS PRESENTED AT THE 1993 ANNUAL MEETING: | |
| THE EFFECTS OF HUMAN DISTURBANCE MITIGATION ON COMMON LOON PRODUCTIVITY IN NORTHWESTERN MONTANA, Lynn M. Kelly..... | 7 |
| STATUS, DISTRIBUTION, AND TRENDS OF LYNX IN THE LOWER FORTY-EIGHT STATES, Philip D. Tanimoto and Edward O.Garton..... | 9 |
| PRESETTLEMENT WILDLIFE AND HABITAT OF MONTANA: AN OVERVIEW, Craig J. Knowles and Pamela R. Knowles..... | 32 |
| ECOLOGY OF MOUNTAIN LIONS IN THE SUN RIVER AREA OF NORTHERN MONTANA, James S. Williams and John McCarthy..... | 33 |
| THE USE OF G.I.S. SYSTEMS, SPACIAL ANALYSIS, AND LANDSCAPE ECOLOGY TO ASSESS AND MANAGE HABITAT FRAGMENTATION IN BEAR POPULATIONS, Christopher Servheen and Per Sandstrom..... | 34 |
| BREEDING ECOLOGY OF THE HARLEQUIN DUCK (<i>Histrionicus histrionicus</i>) IN THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS. David L. Genter, E. Frances Cassirer, Pat Finnegan, and Rick Wallen..... | 35 |
| NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY LANDBIRDS OF THE NORTHERN ROCKIES, Alan G. Christensen..... | 36 |
| MONTANA NATURAL HERITAGE SENSITIVE PLANT PROGRAM, Bonnie L. Heidel..... | 37 |
| HABITAT EFFECTIVENESS AND ELK VULNERABILITY, L. Jack Lyon..... | 38 |
| STATUS OF WOLF REINTRODUCTION INTO YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK AND CENTRAL IDAHO, Edward O. Bangs and Steven H. Fritts... | 43 |
| THE EFFECT OF POOL REGULATION ON AQUATIC MACROPHYTES AND WATERFOWL IN MADISON RESERVOIR, Jon H. Jourdonnais, Frank J. Pickett, Brent Mabbott, and Tim Schultz..... | 49 |
| WOLVES AND THEIR PREY ALONG THE NORTH FORK OF THE FLATHEAD RIVER, D.H. Pletscher and R.R. Ream..... | 50 |
| USING GIS COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY TO EVALUATE ELK RESPONSE TO ROAD DENSITIES IN NORTHWESTERN MONTANA, R.E. Henderson, B. Sterling, R. Mace, and T.O. Lemke..... | 51 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

| | |
|---|----|
| GRIZZLY BEAR USE OF HABITATS MODIFIED BY TIMBER MANAGEMENT, John S. Waller..... | 61 |
| UPDATE OF MONTANA'S BLACK-FOOTED FERRET REINTRODUCTION PROGRAM, Ron Stoneberg..... | 62 |
| REPRODUCTIVE SUCCESS OF A DISTURBED POPULATION OF FERRUGINOUS HAWKS AND PRAIRIE FALCONS IN NORTH CENTRAL MONTANA, Russell Van Horn..... | 65 |
| HABITAT USE AND BEHAVIOR OF MALE MOUNTAIN SHEEP IN FORAGING ASSOCIATIONS WITH WILD HORSES, Kevin Coates and S.D. Schemnitz..... | 66 |

MONTANA CHAPTER, TWS, OFFICERS

| <u>YEAR</u> | <u>PRESIDENT</u> | <u>VICE PRESIDENT</u> | <u>SECRETARY-TREASURER</u> |
|-------------|------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1963-64 | Jack Lyon | Tom Mussehl | Les Pengelly |
| 1965-66 | Louis Moos | Phillip South | Curtis Halvorson |
| 1966-67 | John Harris | Robert Howe/ Jack Schmautz | Tom Mussehl |
| 1967-68 | Harold Picton | Gerry Atwell | Bob Hensler |
| 1968-69 | Reuel Janson | Duane Pyrah | Duane Whitmer |
| 1969-70 | Arnold Foss | Curtis Halvorson | K. Johnson |
| 1970-71 | Buck Compton | Roger Bumstead | William Radtkey |
| 1971-72 | Bart O'Gara | Charles Eustace | John Firebaugh |
| 1972-73 | Roger Bumstead | John Weigand | Robert Ream |
| 1973-74 | Dick Mackie | Jim Cole | Gene Allen |
| | <u>PRESIDENT</u> | <u>PRESIDENT-ELECT</u> | <u>SECRETARY-TREASURER</u> |
| 1974-75 | Jim Cole | Duane Pyrah | Frank Gjersing |
| 1975-76 | Duane Pyrah | Bob Martinka | Rick Wallestad |
| 1976-77 | Bob Martinka | Dick Knight | Glen Erickson |
| 1977-78 | Dick Knight | Ken Coop/ Terry Lonner | Jack Jones |
| 1978-79 | Terry Lonner | John Weigand | Jim Cross |
| 1979-80 | John Weigand | Bob Hensler | John Cada |
| 1980-81 | Bob Hensler | John Ormiston | John Munding |
| 1981-82 | John Ormiston | Charles Eustace | Jon Swenson |
| 1982-83 | Charles Eustace | Jon Malcolm | Mike Hedrick/ Gary Olson |
| 1983-84 | Jon Malcolm | Arnold Dood | Gary Olson |
| 1984-85 | Arnold Dood | Rich DeSimone | Dave Pac |
| 1985-86 | Rich DeSimone | Heidi Youmans | Steve Knapp |
| 1986-87 | Heidi Youmans | Alan Christensen | Harvey Nyberg |
| 1987-88 | Alan Christensen | Joe Ball | Harvey Nyberg |
| 1988-89 | Joe Ball | Mike Aderhold | Ray Mule' |
| 1989-90 | Mike Aderhold | Fritz Prellwitz | Ray Mule' |
| 1990-91 | Fritz Prellwitz | Keith Aune | Bill Haglan |
| 1991-92 | Keith Aune | Gary Dusek | Bill Haglan |
| 1992-93 | Gary Dusek | Wayne Kasworm | Gary Hammond |
| 1993-94 | Wayne Kasworm | Dennis Flath | Gary Hammond |

**MONTANA CHAPTER, TWS
AWARD RECIPIENTS**

Established 1976

YEAR

1976 The first chapter award was made for professional achievement and presented to Wynn Freeman prior to establishment of current chapter awards.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

BIOLOGIST OF THE YEAR

| | | |
|---------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1977-78 | Bob Greene | |
| 1978-79 | Reuel Janson | |
| 1979-80 | Merle Rognrud | |
| 1980-81 | Faye Couey | |
| 1981-82 | Bob Eng | Tom Mussehl |
| 1982-83 | Jim Posewitz | Mike Rath |
| 1983-84 | Ken Walcheck | |
| 1984-85 | | Dale Harms |
| 1985-86 | | |
| 1986-87 | Richard Mackie | |
| 1987-88 | Jim Mitchell/ Larry Thompson | Duane Pyrah |
| 1988-89 | | |
| 1989-90 | Jim Phelps/ Joe Egan | Gary Hammond/ Neil Martin |
| 1990-91 | Jerry Gallagher | Scott Denson |
| 1991-92 | Jack Jones | Mike Thompson |
| 1992-93 | Jack Lyon | |

COMMUNICATIONS**

| | |
|---------|--------------------------|
| 1989-90 | Gary Dusek |
| 1992-93 | Pamela and Craig Knowles |

** The award was established in 1990 by the "Bohemian Corners Foundation" and renamed the "Bob Watts Communication Award" by a bylaw change in April 1991 in memory of C.R. "Bob" Watts, a member of the Foundation.

MONTANA CHAPTER, TWS
WYNN FREEMAN SCHOLARSHIP AWARD
Established 1979

| <u>YEAR</u> | <u>RECIPIENTS</u> | |
|-------------|-------------------|------------------|
| 1980-81 | Karl Grover (MSU) | |
| 1981-82 | Tim Andryk (MSU) | |
| | <u>MSU</u> | <u>UM</u> |
| 1982-83 | Jody Canfield | Robin Rae Brown |
| 1983-84 | Scott Greer | Rob Bennets |
| 1984-85 | John Vore | Sandra Noble |
| 1985-86 | Scott Jackson | Susan Reel |
| 1986-87 | Katie Albrecht | Mark Hurley |
| 1987-88 | Timothy Ferguson | ** |
| 1988-89 | ** | Chris Loggers |
| 1989-90 | Shawn Bayless | Nathan Hall |
| 1990-91 | Thomas Baumeister | Mike Gibeau |
| 1991-92 | Jim Williams | John Hughs |
| 1992-93 | Kevin Podruzny | Denali Henderson |

** Name of recipient was unavailable at time of printing.

THE EFFECTS OF HUMAN DISTURBANCE MITIGATION ON COMMON LOON PRODUCTIVITY IN NORTHWESTERN MONTANA

LYNN M. KELLY, Montana Loon Society, 6525 Rocky Point Road, Polson, MT 59860

SUMMARY

Productivity and effects of human disturbance on common loons (*Gavia immer*) was studied from 1986-1991 in the Tobacco-Stillwater and Clearwater-Swan drainages in northwestern Montana. Observations determining the amount of time spent off nests and the reasons for leaving nests occurred on weekends between 1 May and 15 June during 2 or 4 hour time periods. Time off the nest was quantified using a stopwatch. The critical disturbance distance (the distance at which an approaching boat caused an incubating loon to leave the nest) was determined using a compass and a range finder with a 914 m capability. At the beginning of each observation period the distance and angle between myself and the incubating bird was recorded. If the loon left the nest, the same two measurements were recorded for the approaching boat. The Law of Cosines was then used to calculate the distance between the approaching boat and the loon nest.

Human related disturbance, which included boats and shoreline activities, accounted for 59% of observed flushes and kept loons off their nests an average of 24 minutes per flush. Twelve (52%) of the 23 boats involved in flushing loons were fishing boats. Canoes, kayaks, and rowboats were also observed disturbing nesting loons. Natural activities taking loons off the nest included territorial activities, nest building, heat stress, and insect harassment. These activities accounted for 40% of the flushes and lasted an average of 8 minutes per flush.

Average flushing distances due to approaching boats for the 4 weeks of incubation were 129, 121, 91, and 64 m respectively. Floating signs were placed 137 m (150 yds) from nest sites and formed a voluntary closure around the area. The number of successful nests, number of chicks, and the number of 2-chick broods were significantly increased after the use of the protective floating signs. The increased number of 2-chick broods is especially significant since this represents the maximum breeding potential of common loons (McIntyre 1975). Yonge (1981) determined that the second egg and chick are expendable. Thus, the voluntary closures are giving the loons the extra time needed to bring the second chick off the nest.

When the lakes involved in voluntary closures were categorized by size, the number of 2-chick broods were significantly increased on small lakes (< 250 ha) after the use of floating signs. Thus, when personnel, time, and money are limited, smaller lakes with a breeding pair will benefit more from this management strategy than larger lakes.

Proper placement of floating signs is important. Three to 6 signs should be placed approximately 150 yards in a semicircle

around the nest site. The number of signs will be determined by the location of the nest site. If the signs are placed too far out, their effectiveness diminishes as people may not see the signs and inadvertently enter the nesting area. Despite excellent compliance, signs which close off too large of an area (those which were placed more than 150 yds from the nest) may be ignored, removed, or vandalized.

Once the voluntary closures are in place, public education about the signs and their purpose will greatly improve public compliance. The most effective way to do this is to have an individual talking to the public at the public access sites as they are putting boats into the water. A spotting scope set up on the boat ramp which enables people to see the nesting loon further enhances public knowledge and compliance with voluntary closures. Newspaper articles, radio, TV, and educational talks given to various sporting groups are important components in the public education efforts.

Signs are left in the water for 1-3 weeks after hatching to allow chicks to become strong enough to leave the protected nursery area. However, signs can be removed immediately if the adults move the chicks out of the voluntary closure soon after hatching. It is important to remove the signs within this period of time because if they are left in place, they will be gradually ignored by the recreating public. This may encourage noncompliance during the next nesting season.

LITERATURE CITED

- McIntyre, J. W. 1975. Biology and behavior of the common loon (*Gavia immer*) with reference to its adaptability in a man-altered environment. Univ. of Minnesota. Ph.D Thesis. 230pp.
- Yonge, K. S. 1981. The breeding cycle and annual production of the common loon (*Gavia immer*) in the boreal forest region. Univ. of Manitoba, Winnipeg. M.S. Thesis. 131pp.

**STATUS, DISTRIBUTION, AND TRENDS OF LYNX POPULATIONS IN THE
CONTIGUOUS UNITED STATES**

PHILLIP D. TANIMOTO, Kootenai National Forest Supervisor's
Office, 506 U.S. Highway 2 West, Libby, MT 59923
EDWARD O. GARTON, Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources,
College of Forestry, Wildlife and Range, University of
Idaho, Moscow, ID 83843

The Canada lynx (*Felis canadensis*) inhabited most of North America including much of the United States historically (Hall and Kelson 1959; Figure 1) but has been eliminated from approximately seventeen states, surviving in a few states that retain tracts of taiga. Current evidence examined in this paper suggests that lynx do not occur in some areas recently suggested as lynx range (e.g. Brittell et al. 1989; Figure 2), based upon the absence of recent documentations from many areas.




Figure 1. Historical distribution of the Canada Lynx along the southern limit of its North American range (from Hall and Kelson 1959).




Figure 2. A recent lynx distribution map (from Brittell et al. 1989).

Ecology

Lynx generally occur at relatively low densities with home range sizes ranging from 9 km² to 246 km² (Saunders 1963, Nellis et al. 1972, Berrie 1973, Brand et al. 1976, Koehler et al. 1979, Carbyn and Patriquin 1983, Parker et al. 1983, Stephenson 1984, Brainerd 1985, Bailey et al. 1986, Brittell et al. 1989). They are capable of long-distance dispersal--644 km in one instance (K. Gustafson, SUNY, Syracuse, pers. commun.). Lynx population levels are often closely correlated to those of snowshoe hares (*Lepus americanus*), their principle prey, which undergo regular cycles of increase and decrease (Elton and Nicholson 1942, Dymond 1947, Wing 1953, Keith 1963, Van Zyll de Jong 1966, Brand et al. 1976, Winterhalder 1980). Maxima occur at approximately 9.6 year intervals. In areas containing large expanses of boreal forest, lynx productivity can be surprising. The last three peaks in British Columbia, for example, yielded the following harvests: 12,500 in the trapping season of 1962-63; 8,500 per season during the 1972-73 and 1973-74 seasons; and 6,200 in 1982-83 (Hatler 1988).

In eastern portions of lynx range, with the possible exception of Newfoundland, habitat is not elevation-specific as elevations are more uniformly low. In the Western U.S., however, lynx habitat occurs above latitudinally-correlated elevations such as 2,700 m on the Colorado Plateau (Miller et al. 1981),

1,500 meters in central Washington (Brittelli et al. 1989), and somewhat lower in northeast Washington (Brittelli et al. 1989) where the climate is more continental. The pronounced topographic dissection of much of the western U.S. causes many lynx habitat areas to be small and isolated from the few large areas (M. Tirhi, USDA Forest Service, Olympia, WA, unpubl. lynx habitat maps; pers. commun.).

Recent Fur Trade History

By the late 1960s, trade in spotted neotropical felid pelts was valued at 30 million dollars annually (Meyers 1973), endangering several jaguar and ocelot populations in South and Central America (Meyers 1973, Smith 1976). Actions taken to correct this problem included Brazil's prohibition on commercial hunting in 1967 and the drafting in 1973 of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Fauna and Flora (CITES). CITES was implemented in 1975, severely restricting international trade in endangered and threatened species (McMahan 1986). The time lag for implementation of CITES allowed countries with amassed fur stores to liquidate them on the world market. The removal of Appendix I species from the world market caused a shift to small neotropical cats such as Geoffroy's cat (*Felis geoffroyi*) and the little spotted cat (*Felis tigrina*) and to temperate zone felids including bobcat (*Felis rufus*) and lynx (Funderburk 1986, McMahan 1986). The lynx was listed as an appendix II species, requiring the development of management-based justifications for international trade (Thornback and Jenkins 1982). Market focus on temperate zone felids resulted in pelt price increases. In Montana, lynx pelt values reached a maximum of \$477.00 apiece in 1986, a more than twenty-five-fold increase from 1970 when pelts sold for \$18.60 (data from MDFWP 1991, Figure 3). During the late 1970s and early 1980s, 10,000-14,000 Montana trappers (roughly 1.5 percent of the state's population) were registered annually, taking up to 69 lynx annually (MDFWP 1991).

The objectives of this study were to obtain and synthesize the most up-to-date information available regarding the historic and present distribution of the lynx, south of Canada, and to document population trends. We also hoped to evaluate the implications of this information for lynx conservation and natural resource management.

METHODS

The occurrence of lynx in a given county is generally not verifiable in any given year because confirmed identifications are rare. Therefore, it is impossible to accurately document trends in lynx distribution in most portions of its U.S. range. However, lynx are susceptible to trapping (Parker et al. 1983, Brittelli et al. 1989) and presence is thus verifiable where intensive trapping coincides with lynx abundance. Other




Figure 3. Average lynx pelt market values in Montana (data from MDFWP 1990).

confirmed identifications occur irregularly and contribute to the development of distribution maps.

Sources and Definitions

We contacted fifteen state wildlife agencies to ascertain the level of knowledge and documentation of lynx population parameters in each state. University and non-governmental personnel were also contacted. Documentation provided by these sources, along with other published literature, was reviewed and summarized. Current sightings, track surveys, and harvest records were defined as those occurring after 1979 and were used to estimate current distribution. Current distribution was contrasted with historic distribution derived from records dating as far back as the late nineteenth century. Except where specified, sightings reported as "likely" or "probable" were omitted from this analysis, significantly reducing the data set.

The county was used as the minimum mapping unit based upon the general availability of county-specific data and the general unavailability, unwieldiness, and inaccuracy of finer-resolution data. Occasional sightings that occurred far from optimal lynx habitat areas probably represent irregular dispersal events and were not used to derive range maps.

RESULTS

General Findings

Little information exists on lynx harvests in the U.S. prior to 1965 because trappers and state game agencies often lumped lynx and bobcat together as "lynx cats". This trend continued until 1970 in Colorado and until 1977 in Montana.

Legal lynx harvests have fallen dramatically across the U.S. over the last 15 years (Figure 4). This decline apparently results from decreasing abundance and not from season closures by state game agencies. Harvest quotas over the past several years in Idaho and Montana have not been met (NWF 1991), with the exception of 1991-92 when the limit (2 animals) was trapped in Montana. The Montana harvests occurred close to the Canadian border, which may indicate that lynx dispersing from Canada are being trapped before they are able to establish or replenish more southerly populations. Elsewhere, including Colorado, Idaho, and Wyoming, disjunct populations of undetermined sizes persist. Their tenacity there is associated with relative isolation, inaccessibility, and low human population densities of the areas lynx inhabit.

U.S. LYNX HARVESTS OUTSIDE ALASKA
(data from ID, MN, MT, & WA)




Figure 4. Total legal U.S. lynx harvests over the last 15 years (from Nat. Wildl. Fed. 1991, D.Ware, Washington Dept. Wildlife, Tacoma, pers. comm. 10/91, Dexter 1991).

Lynx are classified as endangered in Colorado, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Wisconsin. They are protected from harvest in ten states, five of which classify them as furbearers with closed seasons. Only Montana and Idaho permit legal harvests (Table 1).

Table 1. Legal status of lynx in the lower 48 States.

| State | Current legal status | Comments |
|---------------|---|---|
| Colorado | Endangered | As of 1973 |
| Idaho | Regulated open season "species of special concern" | Population has not been studied or monitored |
| Maine | Fully protected from harvest | Bounty repealed in 1967 |
| Michigan | Endangered | |
| Minnesota | Fully protected from harvest | As of 1983-84 |
| Montana | Regulated open season | Population has not been studied or monitored |
| New Hampshire | Endangered | Season closed in 1965 |
| New York | Fully protected from harvest | Reintroduced |
| North Dakota | Fully protected from harvest | No recent sightings |
| Oregon | None | Extirpated; no plans for reintroduction |
| Utah | Fully protected from harvest | As of 1974 |
| Vermont | Endangered | No recovery program |
| Washington | Fully protected from harvest | Season closed in 1984 |
| Wisconsin | Endangered | As of early 1970s |
| Wyoming | Fully protected from harvest | As of 1973 |

The north-central Washington lynx population, possibly the largest in the lower forty-eight states, was proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act in June, 1991 (GEA and FLF 1991). That proposal cited ongoing and planned detrimental land use practices and low levels of lynx recruitment as the primary motives for listing. The National Wildlife Federation proposed federal listing for lynx in Idaho, Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah (NWF 1991) documenting declining harvests and lack of monitoring as key issues. The loss or near loss of lynx from Idaho, Montana, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Vermont, Wisconsin, and Utah has made population studies impractical or impossible. Only New York has engaged in a reintroduction program.

Lynx Status by State

Colorado.--Prior to 1970, Colorado lynx pelts were not legally differentiated from those of bobcats. Lynx were first afforded full protection in Colorado in 1973.

In 1978, a fairly comprehensive study of the status of Lynx in Colorado, based upon over 3000 solicitations for information, track surveys, museum and taxidermist specimens, etc., (Miller et al. 1981), was commissioned by the Colorado Division of Wildlife. Its primary purpose was to document historic and current information pertaining to lynx occurrence. The study concluded that lynx distribution is discontinuous and may include parts of Eagle, Lake, Pitkin, and Clear Creek Counties.

Summarizing all information, prior to 1980, lynx were verified from eight Colorado counties (Gunnison, Summit, Montrose, Conejos, Clear Creek, Pitkin, and Eagle) and reported without specimens from an additional ten. For four of the eight verified counties, specimens predated 1926.

In early 1992, T. Andrews and I. Carney surveyed 3,303 km of transect within historic Colorado lynx range for lynx tracks (Andrews 1992). The survey covered parts of Eagle, Pitkin, Lake, and Summit Counties. No tracks found were positively identified as lynx. Sighting information gathered during the same period resulted in seven possible sightings, with none confirmed.

Lynx have been verified in only Clear Creek and Eagle Counties since the end of 1979 (J. Halfpenny, Inst. Arctic & alpine Res., Boulder, pers. commun.; Figure 5).




Figure 5. Number of counties in Colorado where lynx occurred historically and "currently".

Idaho.--Prior to the 1977-78 Idaho furbearer season, the lynx was classified as a predator and no harvest regulations were imposed. Rust (1946:317) described historic lynx abundance in northern Idaho by stating that, "twenty-five to thirty are shot or trapped annually by local trappers and hunters in addition to those secured by state and federal predator control agents." The absence of recent sighting information from that part of the state indicates that Rust was correct when he wrote, "Not as prolific as the bobcat, it is possible that in a few more years the lynx will be well on the way to extermination in northern Idaho" (Rust 1946:317).

The Idaho Department of Fish and Game currently classifies lynx as a "species of special concern" and supports a trapping season with an annual harvest of three individuals. That limit has not been reached in recent years. Since the 1985-86 season, 3 lynx have been taken: 1 during the 89-90 season, and 2 during the 91-92 season (one legal, one illegal). The location for the 89-90 harvest was not determined while those of the 91-92 season, both taken in December 1991, were from Idaho and Lemhi counties (G. Will, Idaho Fish & Game, Boise, pers. commun.) which are considered their current state range. During the 1978-79 season, 3 individuals were also taken from Fremont County, raising the possibility that they also persist there.

During the two preceding lows in lynx population cycles, the lowest annual harvest was 4 individuals (NWF 1991) indicating that lynx in Idaho are at their lowest numbers ever. Idaho lynx harvests from 1974-1991 are shown in figure 6.




Figure 6. Idaho lynx harvests, 1974-1991 (from NWF 1991).

Maine.--The Maine bounty on lynx was repealed in 1967. The Northeast Lynx Status Report (NHDNR undated) states, "lynx may exist as an occasional breeding animal in a very few remote areas of northern and northwestern Maine." However, the status of lynx in Maine is not really known. Recently lynx have been taken in southern, more populated parts of the state coincidental to bobcat harvests (3 lynx in the last 5 years; K. Elowe, Maine Dept. Inland Fisheries and Wildl., Bangor, pers. commun.). The state of Maine has not conducted any reviews or studies pertaining to the status or distribution of Lynx.

The harvest season on lynx in Maine is now closed.

Michigan.--Historically, lynx occurred in most of the Upper Peninsula and at least twenty-three counties of the Lower Peninsula (Baker 1983). Historic occurrence in most of the Lower Peninsula suggests that a breeding population may have occurred there (regular invasion from Canada to the Michigan's Lower Peninsula would be unlikely), suggesting that the population there was self-sustaining. The lynx is classified as endangered in Michigan.

The most recent record of lynx in Michigan obtained during this investigation was an observation on Isle Royale in 1977 (Peterson 1977). That sighting was preceded by a long period of lynx decline. As early as 1948, the species was suspected to be gone from the state (Burt 1948).

Minnesota.--More lynx have been trapped in Minnesota than any other state except Alaska. From 1930 to 1984, approximately 5,655 were trapped (Schultz 1984), for an average of 105 annually. These records do not reflect total harvest by all methods. Bounty records from 1952-1964, for example, indicate that more bounties were paid for lynx pelts than were legally trapped during that period (Schultz 1984). During the last 5 trapping seasons, from 1979-80 through 1983-84, a total of 109 lynx were harvested from sixteen Minnesota counties. In the final 1983-84 season, only 9 were taken. The 16 counties where lynx were taken after 1979 were Becker, Beltrami, Carlton, Cook, Crow Wing, Itasca, Kittson, Koochiching, Lake, Lake of the Woods, Mahanomen, Marshall, Martin, Morrison, Pine, Roseau, and Saint Louis (Dexter 1991). Martin County was not considered current lynx range because it lies far to the south, adjacent to Iowa, in agricultural grassland. We therefore regarded the other fifteen counties as current Minnesota lynx range.

Historic patterns of lynx population cycling in Minnesota indicated that a population peak would occur in the early 1980s. That failed to occur in spite of record snowshoe hare abundances in the northern counties. This incongruity is thought to result from a loss of breeding lynx stock. In addition, scent post surveys in Ontario and Manitoba during 1990 and 1991 indicated declining lynx populations there (B. Berg, Minn. DNR, Grand Rapids, pers. commun.). Minnesota lynx may now occur only as individuals emigrating from Manitoba or Ontario.

Montana.--Lynx harvests were reported for the 1975-76 season as 250 (MDFWP 1990). However that figure is probably inaccurate

since only after the 1976-77 season was a tagging requirement implemented, eliminating confusion with bobcat. It is clear, however, that Montana's lynx harvests have fallen dramatically over the last fifteen years (MDFWP 1990, 1991; NWF 1991).

In 1977, harvests were regulated for the first time with seasons and per-trapper quotas. Since the 1983-84 season, regional and statewide quotas were met just once. This occurred during the 1991-1992 season when two were taken from Lincoln County near the Canadian border (B. Campbell, MDFWP, Kalispell, pers. commun.). During the 1990-91 season, one lynx was trapped and checked in Flathead County (T. Manley, MDFWP, Kalispell, pers. commun.). In June, 1992, a lynx was photographed by an infrared-tripped camera, also in Lincoln County, less than 2 miles from the Canadian border, (W. Kasworm, USFWS, Libby, MT, pers. commun.).

Lynx abundance in Montana is believed to be very low and there is no reason to assume it will recover without the implementation of a recovery program. Roy (1989) concluded that lynx are in serious trouble in Montana and that trapping mortality is the primary factor in preventing lynx recovery there. Figure 7 shows legal Montana lynx harvests from the 1976-77 season through 1992.




Figure 7. Montana lynx harvests, 1977-1991 (from NWF 1991 and B. Campbell, Mont. Dept. Fish, Wildl. & Parks, pers. commun.).

New Hampshire.--Historically, lynx occurred in New Hampshire with sufficient abundance to permit a limited harvest. Actual harvests evidently exceeded sustainable levels, although other factors such as habitat alteration may have also played a role in lynx decline. New Hampshire was unique in that its harvest records distinguished between bobcat and lynx pelts at least as far back as 1931. From 1931 through 1954, 216 lynx were bountied. The number of Legal harvests after 1954 indicates the rarity of lynx in New Hampshire (Figure 8). Harvest was suspended in 1965.




Figure 8. 1931-1955 bounties and 1955-1965 legal harvests for lynx in New Hampshire. Bounty figures (1931-1934) averaged from Silver (1957:300-311); seasonal harvest figures from NHFG (1990).

Before 1954, lynx were harvested from 7 of the state's 10 counties (Cheshire, Carroll, Coos, Grafton, Merrimack, Sullivan, and Hillsboro). No sightings or harvests were listed during the 1970s. In 1983 and 1984 lynx tracks were observed in Coos and Grafton Counties (NHDNR undated); in 1992, a roadkill was reported from Grafton County (J. Litvaitis, White Mts. NF, Laconia, NH pers. commun.). Also in 1992, a sighting originated

from Coos County (White Mountains NF records). Litvaitis et al. (1991) surveyed 130 km of transects for tracks in what is considered to be the core of historic lynx range in the White Mountains and failed to verify lynx presence. In 1992, 648 km of trail was surveyed for lynx tracks in historic lynx habitat without positive results (J. Lanier, White Mts. NF, Laconia, NH, pers. commun.). Although reports continue to occur sporadically, a viable population does not occur in New Hampshire.

New York.--Lynx were apparently never historically prominent in New York, but probably inhabited the high peaks region of the Adirondacks and possibly the Catskills. The Adirondack population was the last to be extirpated in the late 1800s (K. Gustafson, SUNY, Syracuse, pers. commun.). Thereafter, wanderers from other areas occurred rarely. The last documented occurrence of a wild lynx in New York was in the Adirondacks in 1951 (Hamilton and Whitaker 1979). The Lynx was unprotected and bountied until 1970 and was declared a game species with a closed season and afforded complete protection in 1976 (NHFG undated).

A reintroduction program was implemented in 1986 to release lynx from Yukon Territory, Canada into the Adirondacks. 83 lynx were released into Essex, Hamilton, and Franklin counties from 1989 through 1991. Some animals dispersed into Vermont, New Hampshire, and New Brunswick. Of those released, 15 were killed by motor vehicles and at least 22 died of other causes (K. Gustafson, SUNY, Syracuse, pers. commun.). The success of this program will be evident in the years to come. No lynx are believed to exist in New York aside from those released.

North Dakota.--In North Dakota, the lynx is now listed as a game animal with a closed season (S. Allen, ND Game and Fish Dept., Bismarck, pers. commun.).

No evidence suggests that a breeding population of lynx occurs in North Dakota. However, North Dakota is within the historic range of dispersers from portions of lynx range in Manitoba (Adams 1963).

Oregon.--While lynx historically occurred in Oregon, perhaps only as dispersing individuals, the species is now considered extirpated there. The last verified lynx sighting was in Benton County in 1957 and there are no plans for lynx recovery (M. Nugent, End. Species Coordinator, Oregon Dept. Fish & Wildl. pers. commun.).

Utah.--In Utah, the lynx is classified as "sensitive" and was fully protected in 1974. Prior to 1972, eight specimens were verified from four counties: Daggett, Summit, Wasatch, and Sanpete. Since 1980, only 1 lynx has been verified in the state. That animal was trapped in Cache County (far northern Utah) on a bobcat permit in December, 1991 (R. Toone, Utah Natural Heritage Program, Utah DNR, pers. commun.). 2 other occurrences, in Uintah and Summit Counties, were listed as "probable" (McKay 1991).

Vermont.--The lynx is classified as endangered and considered a "nearly extirpated species" in Vermont (VANR 1987). In 1928 one was taken in Windham County (Osgood 1938) and in

1937, One was taken in Addison County (Hamilton and Whitaker 1979). The last confirmed occurrence was in 1968 in Franklin County. To date, no recovery plan has been developed (Jim Di Stefano, Vermont Dept. Fish and Wildl., pers. commun.).

Washington.--The only state outside of Alaska for which research has documented a viable population of lynx, along with an estimate of abundance, is Washington. This population is continuous with that of British Columbia and may experience regular immigrations from the north. Approximately 200 lynx are believed to inhabit northcentral and northwestern portions of the state. This figure represents a median around which the population is believed to fluctuate, with a maximum of approximately 300 and a minimum of approximately of 150 (Koehler 1989, Brittell et al. 1989).

Since 1963, lynx have been legally harvested in 8 Washington counties: Chelan, Douglas, Ferry, Okanogan, Pend Oreille, Spokane, Stevens, and Yakima. Since 1979, lynx were taken in all of those except Douglas, Spokane and Yakima. The remaining 5 counties are believed to be the current range of lynx in Washington (Brittell et al. 1989).

In a situation similar to that of Minnesota, Washington failed to experience a lynx population increase during the last cycle peak, which was anticipated in 1982-1983. Harvest figures since 1970 suggest that lynx numbers have been declining steadily (figures obtained from D. Ware, Upland Bird and Furbearers, Washington DNR, Olympia, pers. commun.). The last harvest maximum occurred in 1976 with 37 lynx taken. 10 years later, none was harvested (Figure 9). While a strict permit system was imposed in 1985, the effect of this action on the population cannot be ascertained.




Figure 9. Legal Washington lynx harvests, 1980-1990.

Recognizing the significance of its lynx population, the Okanogan National Forest is developing a management plan that will attempt to integrate timber extraction with lynx conservation (B. Naney and G. Halekas, Okanogan N.F. pers. commun.).

Wisconsin.--Lynx were bountied in Wisconsin from 1865 until 1957 and listed as endangered there in 1972. They were reported in 12 counties from 1976 through 1984 (Thiel 1987). This information was not broken down into pre and post-1980 categories. The counties of occurrence were Douglas, Bayfield, Ashland, Iron, Burnett, Washburn, Sawyer, Price, Oneida, Forest, Marinett, and Shawano. These were represented by 63 individuals. Of those, 56 occurred in 7 northwestern counties. While Wisconsin lies squarely within historic lynx range, a breeding population is not likely to occur there (Thiel 1987, Thiel and Halloway undated). The observed cyclicity of lynx abundance there is thought to have occurred solely as a result of periodic emigrations from Minnesota. This was evidenced by the fact that museum specimens had been taken only during cycle peaks and never at cycle lows (Thiel 1987). The shrinking lynx population of Minnesota raises the possibility that northern Wisconsin could lose its designation as lynx range in the future.

Presently, 1 or 2 lynx sightings are reported each year by bobcat trappers in Douglas and Bayfield counties in northwestern Wisconsin (R. Jurewicz, WDNR, pers. commun.). Those counties are considered current Wisconsin lynx range.

Wyoming.--The lynx was afforded legal protection from harvest in Wyoming in 1973 when it was classified as a "protected animal".

Reeve et al. (1986) solicited information pertaining to lynx distribution, rating responses on a 1-4 probability scale, with 1 defined as certain, 2 as probable, 3 as questionable, and 4 as unlikely. For sightings dated 1980 and later, 62 are listed as probable, while only 1, from Natrona County, is listed as certain. While it is highly unlikely that all identifications listed as probable are incorrect, it would be presumptuous to derive a distribution map upon unconfirmed reports. Therefore we compromised by assuming that current Wyoming lynx distribution consists of those counties in which five or more sightings listed as probable occurred.

Counties of occurrence were deciphered from the maps and UTM coordinates provided in Reeve et al. (1986). Current Wyoming lynx distribution is Fremont, Lincoln, Park, Sublette and Teton Counties. The single confirmed identification from Natrona county, far from other concentrations or earlier range descriptions (e.g. Clark and Stromberg 1987) is not likely to represent a breeding population and was not included in the range map.

The size of the existing Wyoming lynx population may be of the same order of magnitude as that of Washington. Currently there are no monitoring procedures in effect there (A. Langston, Wyoming Game & Fish Dept., pers. commun) and National Forests in

Wyoming maintain no files on lynx (J. Freidlander, USFS, Denver, pers. commun.).

DISCUSSION

The information presented here suggests that downward trends in lynx abundance have occurred through most areas of lynx range in the contiguous U.S. and that lynx distribution is shrinking. Much of the decline has occurred during the last 2 decades. The middle-and-upper elevation forests that comprise lynx habitat are generally more recently-roaded and harvested than low elevation forests (Harris et al. 1982), helping explain why so dramatic a decline in lynx numbers has occurred so recently.

Based upon all of the confirmed lynx locations cited since 1979, including the Adirondack release sites, current lynx range by county is shown in Figure 10. While it is likely that lynx occur outside of the areas shown in Figure 10, the map could prove liberal in the future as habitats are further reduced in quality and areal extent. One should also consider that the map fails to indicate that much of the area within each shaded polygon consists of non-habitat.




Figure 10. Current U.S. lynx distribution map, by county, for the lower forty-eight states.

Recommendations for restoration of lynx habitat, and of snowshoe hares, their principle prey, are available from the literature (e.g. Koehler et al. 1979, Wolff 1980, Bittner and Rongstad 1982, Parker 1981, Parker et al. 1983, Keith et al. 1984, Bailey et al. 1986, Brittell et al. 1989, Koehler and Brittell 1990). However, habitat may be of secondary importance to trapping pressure and incidental harvest in some areas where lynx have been persecuted and continue to be taken on bobcat or other furbearer tags. Under sustained trapping pressure, lynx harvests have been shown to be completely additive (Brand and Keith 1979, Quinn and Thompson 1987). Consequently, the British Columbia Ministry of the Environment monitors its populations and suspends trapping seasons during cycle lows (V. Bancie, B.C. Ministry of Env., Victoria, B.C., pers. commun. 9/92). Because few animals are trapped during cycle lows, the influence of this action on pelt revenues is small. However, this precautionary measure may be insufficient to ensure sustained harvests there, evidenced by a 50% decline in harvests over the last three cycle peaks (data from Hatler 1988).

In other areas such as northwestern Montana and the Cascade Mountains, intensive logging results in habitat changes of paramount importance. While modified logging prescriptions could provide for snowshoe hare requirements, standard procedures degrade or eliminate denning habitat and create forest openings far larger than lynx are willing to cross (Brittell et al. 1989).

Coarse woody debris, cited as a key habitat component for lynx denning, (Berrie 1973, Guggisberg 1975, Koehler and Hash 1979) has been systematically depleted through timber harvest and management prescriptions. The burning of slash, ostensibly to prepare the seed bed and to reduce fire hazard, is almost universal. For example, more than 200,000 acres are burned annually in Oregon and Washington, for silvicultural purposes (Kauffman 1990). This action reduces structural heterogeneity at and near ground level in managed forests. Other cutting prescriptions such as "seed tree harvests" (intended to leave mature, seed-producing trees on-site) open forests dramatically and are typically followed by slash burning. Functionally, such sites may differ little from clearcuts for fauna that depend upon coarse woody debris.

Some optimism for lynx conservation in timber producing areas lies in the association of lynx and snowshoe hares with early seral and mixed forests in Washington (Brittell et al. 1989), and with dense, young lodgepole pine stands in Montana (Koehler et al. 1979). However, associations of lynx dens with old forests of northern and northeast aspects (Koehler 1987, 1989) have obvious implications regarding the lack of this consideration in timber harvesting today, as virtually all forested land available for logging has already been logged at least once.

Lynx apparently do best in areas with high levels of habitat interspersion, using different habitat types for feeding, travel, and denning. While optimum interspersion levels are unknown

(Hatler 1988), geographic information systems could be used to examine this and other questions related to landscape configuration.

The importance of wildfire in maintaining high levels of interspersed at higher elevations should be noted. The correlation between wildfire and higher elevations was determined for the Cascades of Oregon (Burke 1979) and may hold for other mountainous areas. Prehistoric fires would have maintained high levels of interspersed, providing ample post-fire forage for snowshoe hares (Fox 1978), while wildfire suppression, practiced as a rule on public and private timber lands, eliminates the natural post-fire sere. Fire-suppressed areas may exhibit larger patch sizes and lower levels of interspersed.

The success of reintroductions of sensitive, threatened, and endangered species, in particular carnivores whose populations are declining, is much lower than that of ungulates and herbivores. Griffith et al. (1989) determined a 46% success rate for all sensitive, threatened, and endangered species reintroduction projects surveyed ($n = 80$) while that of native game species was 86% ($n = 118$). Theoretical considerations (e.g. Griffith et al. 1989) and cost considerations suggest that lynx reintroduction programs should be considered avenues of last resort so long as viable populations are extant. However, given that adequate habitat, prey, and protection can be provided, reintroductions may be useful in the future.

To date, there has been no unified effort to address the declining trend in lynx populations in the U.S. The lynx is currently a candidate for listing as an endangered species by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Its legal designation as a federally endangered species throughout its range, south of Canada, would be a reasonable option given that current information suggests that the number of lynx present in this vast area may not exceed several hundred individuals--far fewer than many other species now listed as endangered. Successful recovery will require each state within historic lynx breeding range to begin or to continue an active lynx monitoring or recovery program, to publish habitat guidelines and goals, and to identify existing and potential habitats. The cooperation of various agencies and private groups will be essential, and habitat impacts should be mapped to identify appropriate recovery zones while disruptive land use practices should be modified or curtailed.

SUMMARY

We reviewed the current status of lynx populations and their distributions in the lower forty-eight states. Current breeding distribution probably includes parts of Idaho, Minnesota, Montana, Washington, and Wyoming. Breeding status in Colorado, Maine, New York, Utah, and Wisconsin is undetermined. Lynx are apparently extirpated from Oregon, North Dakota, Michigan, Vermont, and New Hampshire. Summarized data suggest that lynx

are losing areal distribution and numbers. Trends over the last two decades also suggest that some small populations may have disappeared, and that others are likely to disappear in the near future.

Lynx populations are sensitive to habitat disturbance and conversion, and to trapping. The extent to which upper-elevation forests have been logged in recent years correlates with lynx decline, indicating that lynx recovery will require innovative initiatives in habitat management. Optimism for lynx recovery lies in lynx and snowshoe hare habitat relationships and the fact that lynx use a variety of successional and old growth habitats.

LITERATURE CITED

- Adams, A.W. 1963. The lynx explosion. North Dakota Outdoors 26:20-24.
- Andrews, T. 1992. Colorado lynx Survey. Rep. to Colorado Div. Wildl., Denver, Col. 59pp.
- Bailey, T.N., E.E. Bangs, M.F. Portner, J.C. Malloy, and R.J. McAvinchey. 1986. An apparent overexploited lynx population on the Kenai Peninsula, Alaska. J. Wildl. Manage. 50(2):279-290.
- Baker, R.H. 1983. Michigan Mammals. Michigan State University Press, Ann Arbor. 642pp.
- Berrie, P.M. 1973. Ecology and status of the lynx in interior Alaska. Pages 4-41 in R.L. Eaton, ed. The World's Cats, Vol I, Ecology and Conservation. Metropolitan Printing, Portland, Oregon. 349pp.
- Bittner, S.L. and O.J. Rongstad. 1982. Snowshoe hare and allies. Pages 146-163 in J.A. Chapman and G.A. Feldhamer, eds. Wild Mammals of North America. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland. 1,147pp.
- Brand, C.J. and L.B. Keith. 1979. Lynx demography during a snowshoe hare decline in Alberta. J. Wildl. Manage. 43: 827-849.
- _____, L.B. Keith, and C. Fischer. 1976. Lynx responses to changing snowshoe hare densities in central Alberta. J. Wildl. Manage. 40:416-428.
- Brainerd, S.M. 1985. Reproductive ecology of bobcats and lynx in western Montana. M.S. Thesis. Univ. Montana., Missoula. 90pp.

- Brittell, J.D., R.J. Poelker, S.J. Sweeney, G.M. Koehler. 1989. Native Cats of Washington. Washington Dept. Wildl., Olympia. 169pp.
- Burke, C.J. 1979. Historic fires in the central western Cascades, Oregon. M.S. Thesis. Oregon State Univ., Corvallis. 130pp.
- Burt, W.H. 1948. The Mammals of Michigan. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor. 288pp.
- Carbyn, L.N. and D. Patriquin. 1983. Observations on home range sizes, movements and social organization of lynx, *Lynx canadensis*, in Riding Mountain National Park, Manitoba. Can. Field Nat. 97:262-267.
- Clark, T.W. and M.R. Stromberg. 1987. Mammals in Wyoming. University Press of Kansas, Museum of Natural History Lawrence, Kans. 314pp.
- Dexter, M.H., compiler. 1991. Status of Wildlife Populations, Fall 1991 and 1981-1990 Hunting and Trapping Harvest Statistics. Unpub. Rep., Section of Wildlife, Minn. Dept. Nat. Res., St. Paul. 136pp.
- Dymond, J.R. 1947. Fluctuations in animal populations with special reference to those of Canada. Trans. Royal Soc. Canada 41:1-34.
- Elton, C. and M. Nicholson. 1942. The ten-year cycle in numbers of the lynx in Canada. J. Anim. Ecol. 11:215-244.
- Fox, J.F. 1978. Forest Fires and the snowshoe hare-Canada lynx cycle. Oecologia 31(3):349-374.
- Funderburk, S. 1986. International trade in U.S. and Canadian Bobcats, 1977-1981. Pgs. 489-501 in S.D. Miller and D.D. Everett, eds. Cats of the World: biology, conservation, and management. National Wildl. Fed., Wash., D.C. 501pp.
- Greater Ecosystem Alliance (GEA) and Friends of the Loomis Forest (FLF). 1991. Petition to list the North Cascades, Washington population of Canada lynx (*Felis lynx canadensis*) as an Endangered species. Bellingham, Wash. and Loomis, Wash. 13pp.
- Griffith, B., J.M. Scott, J.W. Carpenter, and C. Reed. 1989. Translocation as a species conservation tool: status and Strategy. Science 245:477-480.
- Guggisberg, C.A.W. 1975. Wild Cats of the World. Taplinger, New York. 328pp.

- Hall, E.R. and K.R. Kelson. 1959. The Mammals of North America. Vol.II. Ronald Press, New York. 1083pp.
- Hamilton, W.J., Jr. and J.O. Whitaker. 1979. Mammals of the eastern United States. 2nd Ed. Cornell Univ. Press, Ithaca, New York. 346pp.
- Harris, L.D., C. Maser, and A. McKee. 1982. Patterns of old growth harvest and implications for Cascades Wildlife. Proc. 47th N. Amer. Wildl. and Natural Res. Conf. 374-391.
- Hatler, D.F. 1988. A Lynx Management Strategy for British Columbia. Wildlife Bull. B-61. Ministry of the Env., Victoria, BC. 115pp.
- Kauffman, J.B. 1990. Ecological Relationships of Vegetation and Fire in Pacific Northwest Forests. Pgs. 39-52 in J.D. Walstad, S.R. Radosevich, and D.V. Sandberg, eds. Natural and Prescribed Fire in Pacific Northwest Forests. Oregon State Univ. Press, Corvallis. 317pp.
- Keith, L.B. 1963. Wildlife's ten-year cycle. Univ. Wis. Press, Madison. 201pp.
- _____, J.R. Cary, O.J. Rongstad, and M.C. Brittingham. 1984. Demography and ecology of a declining snowshoe hare population. Wildl. Monogr. 90. 43pp.
- Koehler, G.M. 1987. The ecology of the lynx (*Lynx canadensis*) in northcentral Washington. Unpubl. Prog. Rep., Wildl. Res. Inst., Univ. Idaho, Moscow. 25pp.
- _____. 1989. Population and habitat characteristics of lynx and snowshoe hares in north central Washington. Can. J. Zool. 68:845-851.
- _____, M.G. Hornocker, and H.S. Hash. 1979. Lynx movements and habitat use in Montana. Can. Field. Nat. 99:441-442.
- _____ and J.D. Brittell. 1990. Managing spruce-fir habitat for lynx and snowshoe hares. J. Forestry. 88:10-14.
- Litvaitis, J.A., D. Kingman Jr., J. Lanier, E. Orff. 1991. Status of lynx in New Hampshire. Trans. Northeast Sect. Wildl. Soc. 48:70-75.
- McKay, R. 1991. Biological Assessment and Inventory Plan for the North American Lynx (*Felis lynx canadensis*) in the Uinta Mountains. Ashley National Forest (USFS) and Utah Natural heritage Program, Utah Dept. Nat. Resources, Salt Lake City. 65pp.

- McMahan, L. 1986. The international cat trade. Pgs. 461-488 in S.D. Miller and D.D. Everett, eds. Cats of the World: biology, conservation and management. National Wildlife Federation, Washington, D.C. 501pp.
- Meyers, N. 1973. Spotted cats and the fur trade. Pages 276-326 in R.L. Eaton, ed. The World's Cats, Vol I, Ecology and conservation. Metropolitan Printing Co., Portland, Or. 349pp.
- Miller, G.C., S. Bissell, R. Calderon, M. Foster, J. Garcia, W. Graul, J. Halfpenny, C. Loeffler, L. Lofgren, T. Lytle, L. Marlow, D. Nead, P. Shearwood, J. Torrea, T. Valenta, T. Washington. 1980. Lynx and Wolverine Verification, Final Report. Project SE-3-3. Pages 53-82 in Wildlife Research Report 1981. Colorado Div. Wildlife, Fort Collins. 161 pp.
- Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks (MDFWP). 1990. Montana lynx population status and considerations. Helena, Montana. 13pp.
-
- 1991.
- Environmental Assessment, for Fur Trapping Program of the 1991-1992 season. Helena, Mont. 22pp.
- Mumford, P.E. 1969. Distribution of the Mammals of Indiana. Indiana Acad. Sci., Monogr. No. 1. 114pp.
- National Wildlife Federation (NWF). 1991. Draft petition for a rule to list the lynx as endangered. Northern Rockies Natural Resource Center, Missoula, Montana. 24pp.
- Nellis, C.H., S.P. Wetmore, and L.B. Keith. 1972. Lynx-prey interactions in central Alberta. J. Wildl. Manage. 36:320-329.
- New Hampshire Fish and Game Department (NHFG). undated. Northeast lynx status report. Durham. 2pp.
-
1990. New
- Hampshire furbearer harvest records, unpubl. data. Durham, N.H.
- Osgood, F.L. 1938. The mammals of Vermont. J. Mamm. 19:435-441.
- Parker, G.R. 1981. Winter habitat use and hunting activities of lynx (*Lynx canadensis*) on Cape Breton Island, Nova Scotia. Pages 221-248 in Chapman, J.A. and D. Pursley, eds. Proc. 1980 Worldwide Furbearer Conf., Frostburg, Md. 2,056pp.

- Parker, G.R., J.W. Maxwell, L.D. Morton, and G.E.J. Smith. 1983. The ecology of the lynx (*Lynx canadensis*) on Cape Breton Island. *Can. J. Zool.* 61:770-786.
- Peterson, R.O. 1977. Wolf Ecology and prey relationships on Isle Royale. National Park Service, Monogr. Ser. No. 11, xx + 210pp.
- Quinn, N.W. and J.E. Thompson. 1987. Dynamics of an exploited Canada lynx population in Ontario. *J. Wildl. Manage.* 51(2):297-305.
- Reeve, A., F. Lindzey, and S. Buskirk. 1986. Historic and Recent Distribution of the Lynx in Wyoming. Wyoming Coop. Fish and Wildl. Res. Unit., Laramie. 55pp.
- Roy, K. 1989. Formulation of a Montana Lynx Management Plan. Department of Wildlife Biology, University of Montana, Missoula. 13pp.
- Rust, H.J. 1946. Mammals of northern Idaho. *J. Mamm.* 27(4): 308-327.
- Saunders, J.K. 1963. Movements and activities of the lynx in Newfoundland. *J. Wildl. Manage.* 27:390-400.
- Schultz, D.F., compiler. 1984. Status of wildlife populations, fall 1984, 1979-1983 hunting and trapping harvest statistics. Unpubl. Rep., Section of Wildlife, Minn. Dept. Nat. Res., St. Paul. 94pp.
- Silver, H. 1957. A history of New Hampshire game and furbearers. Survey Report No. 6, 2nd edition. 466pp. Smith, N.J.H. 1976. Spotted cats and the Amazon skin trade. *Oryx* 13:363-371.
- Stephanson, R.O. 1984. Development of lynx population estimation techniques. Prog. Rep. Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Project. W-22-3. Alaska Dept. Fish and Game, Juneau. 5pp.
- Thiel, R.P. 1987. The status of Canada Lynx in Wisconsin, 1865-1980. Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters. 75:90-96.
- _____ and A. Halloway. 1988. Canada Lynx. Wisconsin Dept. Nat. Resources, Bureau of Endangered Resources. PUBL-ER-509. 4pp.
- Thornback, J. and M. Jenkins. 1982. IUCN Mammal Red Data Book, Part I. International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, Gland, Switzerland, 512pp.

- Van Zyll de Jong, C.G. 1966. Food habits of the lynx in Alberta and the Mackenzie District, N.W.T. *Can. Field Nat.* 80:18-23.
- Vermont Agency of Natural Resources (VANR) 1987. The endangered and threatened species of plants and animals in Vermont. North Springfield, Vermont. 11pp.
- Wing, L.W. 1953. Cycles of lynx abundance. *J. Cycle Res.* 2(2):28-51.
- Winterhalder, B.P. 1980. Canadian fur bearer cycles and Cree-Ojibwa hunting and trapping practices. *Am. Nat.* 115:870-879.
- Wolff, J.A. 1980. The role of habitat patchiness in the population dynamics of snowshoe hares. *Ecol. Manage.* 50(1):111-130.

PRESETTLEMENT WILDLIFE AND HABITAT OF MONTANA: AN OVERVIEW

CRAIG J. KNOWLES, FaunaWest Wildlife Consultants, P.O. Box 113,
Boulder, MT 59632

PAMELA R. KNOWLES, FaunaWest Wildlife Consultants, P.O. Box 113,
Boulder, MT 59632

Under contract with the U.S.D.A. Forest Service, we developed a bibliography of books, papers, and documents with at least some natural history information pertaining to Montana and adjacent lands during the 19th century. Included with this bibliography is an annotation of major expeditions and explorers, tables cross referencing expeditions with drainages traversed, and a roster of early Montana naturalists. Expeditions into Montana began in 1802 and continued throughout the century. Early natural history notes generally were recorded by people with no biological training and tended to be highly qualitative. Later natural history notes generally were recorded by people with biological training and became increasingly more detailed and scientific in nature. Natural history information is available for nearly all regions of Montana, although, certain areas received greater attention than others. Despite the lack of quantitative data, it would be possible to establish regional lists of common mammals and birds, and their relative abundance from sources listed here. We also found relative abundance of timber and grass were consistently recorded even by journalists with no biological training. After reviewing numerous journals and narratives, our impression is that Montana has undergone ecosystem wide reductions in native wildlife. We present journal summaries in support of this statement.

Copies of this report are available from the Regional Office of the U.S. Forest Service in Missoula, Montana.

ECOLOGY OF MOUNTAIN LIONS IN THE SUN RIVER AREA OF NORTHERN MONTANA

JAMES S. WILLIAMS, Biology Department, Montana State University,
Bozeman, MT 59717

JOHN McCARTHY, Montana Dept. Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, P.O. Box
306, Augusta, MT 59410

ABSTRACT

Mountain lion (*Felis concolor missoulensis*) habitat use, foraging habits, and home area characteristics were investigated in the Sun River area of northern Montana. Twenty-five mountain lions were monitored in 1991-1992. Mountain lions selected closed-conifer, open-conifer, deciduous tree, and shrubland cover types. Mountain lions avoided grassland and vegetated rock cover types. Mountain lions preferred areas near a stream course (0-200 m). They did not avoid roads or USFS recreational trails. They were found on slopes ranging from gentle (<20%) to steep (>69%). Mountain lions preferred eastern aspects, elevations ranging 1219 m to 1828 m, and were located in both broken and unbroken topography. Mean annual home area size was among the smallest reported in the literature. Mean annual home area size for prairie-front mountain lions was smaller than mountain lions that utilized interior areas. Home area size for prairie-front males was larger than for prairie-front females. Interior male home area size did not differ significantly from interior females. There was considerable overlap in female home areas. Mountain lions used core areas within their individual home areas. Mountain lions primarily killed deer, bighorn sheep, and elk. Bighorn sheep, elk, and mule deer were killed more often during winter (Nov-Apr). White-tailed deer, and smaller mammals were killed more often during summer (May-Oct). Overall, elk contributed more biomass to the diet of mountain lions than deer and bighorn sheep. Specifically, elk bulls, cows, bighorn sheep ewes, and mule deer bucks contributed the most biomass to mountain lion diets. Three instances of cannibalism by mountain lions were documented.

This presentation was a summary of research from M.S. thesis research of the senior author and is available from the Montana State University Library in Bozeman.

**THE USE OF G.I.S. SYSTEMS, SPACIAL ANALYSIS, AND LANDSCAPE
ECOLOGY TO ASSESS AND MANAGE HABITAT FRAGMENTATION IN BEAR
POPULATIONS**

CHRISTOPHER SERVHEEN, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NS 312,
University of Montana, Missoula, MT 59812
PER SANDSTROM, Montana Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit,
University of Montana, Missoula, MT 59812

Fragmentation of bear habitat is an ongoing cause of habitat decline worldwide. Causes of habitat fragmentation are directly related to human activities including road building and use, home development, timber harvest, reservoir development, railroads, and human presence. When such human actions are arrayed in a linear fashion, they have the potential to limit the passage of bears through habitat and to decrease the potential for survival of bears that more through or live within such disturbance areas. We have developed methods to overlay human activities using a computer-based G.I.S. database system. This method allows summarizing human activities throughout the linear area in question. By combining these human activity data with information on the impacts of each human activity, we are able to assess the potential significance along a linear zone of human actions in terms of two major criteria of importance to bears: 1) habitat disturbance; and 2) mortality risk. Using these data and data on the existing and potential landscape structure and function of the linear area in question, we can identify potential areas that can act as linkage zones between areas of habitat separated by the linear area of human activities. These linkage zones can be identified on detailed maps and the management within them specified if they are to be maintained a linkages. Such management details can then be implemented by land management agencies to minimize habitat fragmentation before it occurs or to enhance linkages between areas that have already be fragmented.

BREEDING ECOLOGY OF THE HARLEQUIN DUCK (*Histrionicus histrionicus*) IN THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS.

David L. Genter, Montana Natural Heritage Program, Helena, MT
59620

E. Frances Cassirer, Idaho Fish and Game, Lewiston, ID 83501;
Pat Finnegan, Lewis and Clark National Forest, Choteau, MT 59422;
Rick Wallen, Grand Teton National Park, Moose, WY 83012.

Harlequin ducks have been known to migrate inland to nest on mountain streams since the first naturalists explored the northern Rocky Mountain Region. Recent studies in Montana, Idaho and Wyoming have found this species to be rare and quite local in distribution and abundance. Arrival dates from the coast vary with elevation but most mated pairs and bachelor males arrive on breeding streams in late March and April. Harlequins typically select low gradient (<2%), second to fourth order streams with high water quality and little human disturbance. Harlequins are closely associated with riffle and run stream habitats with a cobble or boulder substrate. Marked birds demonstrate high site fidelity; females exhibit natal fidelity. Breeding occurs over a four week period; females construct a nest for 2-8 eggs and incubate for 28 days. Nests have been found in hollow snags, cliff sites, in-stream woody debris (jams), and on islands behind woody vegetation. Young are flightless for 56 days, initially using waters with lower velocity and later foraging in faster water. Brood weights at fledging vary, apparently with productivity of natal streams. Pair densities range from 1 pair per km of linear stream to less than 1 pair per 16 km. Nesting success and survival to fledging of known juveniles vary considerably (12-68% and 16-88%, respectively). Primary factors influencing productivity are timing and magnitude of spring runoff. Population estimates for the study area during the breeding season are: Montana: 260 (110 pr.), Idaho: less than 100, Wyoming: less than 100.

NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY LANDBIRDS OF THE NORTHERN ROCKIES

Alan G. Christensen, U.S. Forest Service, 200 East Broadway, Box
7669, Missoula, MT 59807

About 140 species of landbirds that breed in Region One (consisting mainly of Montana) are neotropical migrants. That is, they breed in North America and their wintering grounds extend into Mexico, Central, and South America.

As a group, neotropical migrants make up roughly 75% of all landbirds that breed in Region One. In recent years the status of some species of neotrops has been in decline. This has been attributed to a number of reasons such as forest fragmentation, nest parasitism, habitat loss on both breeding and wintering grounds, and the effects of pesticides. Declines have been well documented for some Eastern species, where sufficient data has been gathered. A chronic management problem in the West has been the lack of data in general and the paucity of any long term (>20 years) observations, specifically. Efforts are underway to gather data on bird abundance and distribution, reproductive success, habitat relationships, and long term trends. This program will combine the efforts of Federal, State, private, and academic entities.

OVERVIEW OF THE MONTANA SENSITIVE PLANT PROGRAMS

BONNIE L. HEIDEL, Botanist, Montana Natural Heritage Program,
P.O. Box 201800, Helena, MT 59620

Montana has over 2400 vascular plant taxa, of which 390 are being tracked as state species of special concern based on their low numbers and perceived or potential imperilment. This recognition does not confer protection, but is the list structure for botanical information in the Biological Conservation Database of the Montana Natural Heritage Program. This centralized information is routinely consulted in private and public environmental assessments and management planning. The state list is continually updated based on survey, monitoring, and taxonomic studies. It is distributed annually in spring and is available from:

Montana Natural Heritage Program
State Library
1515 E. 6th Ave.
P.O. Box 201800
Helena, MT 59620-1800

The 1993 Federal Register Notice of Review (Vol. 58, No. 188 of 30 Sept. 1993) places 23 Montana vascular plant taxa in Category 2 (C2; taxa for which information now in possession of the Service indicates that proposing to list them as endangered or threatened species is possibly appropriate, but for which substantial data on biological vulnerability and threats are not currently known or on file to support the immediate preparation of rules), and one species (*Howellia aquatilis*) proposed as threatened (PT). Note: Comments have been filed on 1993 Federal Register Notice of Review errors, updates, and warranted status changes for Montana. Also, 26 Montana plant taxa have been dropped from further consideration over the years (3C and 3B categories). For copies of the 1993 FR Notice of Review:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Fish and Wildlife Enhancement
P.O. Box 10023
Helena, MT 59626-0023

Region 1 of the U.S. Forest Service has a sensitive species list and policy; an updated list is pending as of 4 February 1994. Each Forest has a sensitive plants contact person. Regional botany contact is:

Steve Shelly
U.S. Forest Service - Region 1
WLF
P.O. Box 7669
Missoula, MT 59807

HABITAT EFFECTIVENESS AND ELK VULNERABILITY

L. JACK LYON, Forestry Sciences Lab, Intermountain Research
Station, USDA Forest Service, Box 8089, Missoula, MT 59807

Public interest in the management and protection of North American elk has expanded well beyond purely biological considerations. In Montana, elk hunting is \$65 million industry. The state sells 100,000 elk hunting licenses, provides 600,000 recreation days, and has recognized a major growth potential in nonconsumptive uses. Despite a growing pressure on the elk resource, the annual harvest has more than doubled. We probably have twice as many animals today as we had 30 years ago. Here, and elsewhere in the West, managers have demonstrated they can produce elk in many habitats. We are now entering an era in which we have to consider some of the ethical and moral reasons for doing so. The most pressing and immediate management concerns involve several aspects of elk vulnerability during the hunting season.

Thirty years ago, winter mortality was a primary cause of death for big game animals. A major game management concern was reducing animal numbers to prevent damage to winter range forage plants. Winter weather may become important again, but for the last ten years, 90% of elk mortality has been caused by hunting.

In most of the West, management of the elk harvest has involved control of season length and limited permit hunting of cows, while an unrestricted bull harvest has been retained. One widespread result has been a decline in numbers of breeding bulls remaining after the hunting season. Today, many elk herds have distorted population structures that deviate substantially from public expectations and may be biologically unsound. Other western states have reported herds with mature bull:cow ratios of 5:100 on the winter range. There are some herds in which the majority of breeding is accomplished by yearling spike bulls.

Montana has not reached a critical stage yet, but statewide harvest statistics indicate that increases in numbers of animals killed have mostly been cows and spike bulls. Branch-antlered harvest has increased less than 20 percent and the average antler has dropped from 5 to 3 points. There are biological, esthetic, and commercial reasons for having big bulls in an elk herd. Correction of these distortions can only be achieved by reducing the annual harvest of mature bulls.

Reductions in season length, however, are not necessarily seen as a solution. Experience with shorter seasons in Oregon and elsewhere has revealed situations that can only be interpreted as deterioration in hunter behavior and ethics. As the number of hunters increases, the number of legal bulls available declines. When the management response is a shorter hunting season the all too common result is a brief and essentially disgusting spectacle in which elk are unreasonably harassed and the morality of hunting as a sport comes into

question. If elk hunting is to continue as a legitimate sporting activity, consideration must be given to controlling the levels of harassment and behavior of the participants.

The highest priorities involve management parameters that will produce greater bull escapement without reducing recreation potential. We need to identify combinations of vegetative and topographic variables that provide security and escapement for hunted elk. We must identify the hunting pressure limits required to overwhelm even optimal habitat characteristics. We can no longer rely on simplistic answers based on hiding cover patch sizes, or hunter densities and season length. Successful elk management is almost certain to require simultaneous examination or modeling of habitats and hunter behavior in those habitats.

It's pretty clear that the reason bull numbers are declining is that bulls get shot. However, there are a lot of corollary causes, one of the most important of which is timber harvest and roads. When this relationship was first recognized it was accepted as a good thing, but as time went on it turned into too much of a good thing. As a result, between 1970 and the mid 80s, there were a number of studies of the relationships between timber harvest, road construction, and elk habitat productivity. Those studies, in turn, produced habitat models that were widely incorporated into forest plans.

In the simplest form, Forest Plan models included a cover/forage curve to predict habitat potential, a road model to estimate reductions in use near open roads, and some guidelines for protecting key areas like moist sites and wallows. These are relatively straightforward concepts, and they are generally well documented. The expected product was a value, Habitat Effectiveness, a measure of the ability of habitats to produce and sustain elk during the summer.

Unfortunately, a lot of things went wrong on the way to application. Even if properly applied, there should have been some question about the recommended opening size of 40 acres, especially when compounded by local recommendation for openings even smaller. On the land, this comes out to be 40-acre measles, and it is bound to grow into 40-acre cover patches that are unquestionably too small. Habitat effectiveness has also been widely misapplied to hunting seasons, winter ranges, and a variety of other situations where it made no sense. And, along the way, some new terms and contrived definitions were invented -- as well as some contrived methods of application. One result was a growing confusion in terminology, to the point that biologists talking about elk and elk habitat encountered difficulties in communicating with each other. Two events grew out of this confusion. The first was a 2-day workshop held at the University of Montana's Lubrecht Experimental Forest in 1990. About 30 biologists participated in a facilitated workshop intended to clarify and standardize some of the elk management terminology. Many different terms were discussed, but the primary accomplishments of the workshop were to clearly identify

habitat effectiveness as the ability of habitat to grow and produce elk and establish vulnerability as a measure of habitat ability to protect elk. The results of these discussions were presented at the Western States Elk workshop and have been published as Intermountain Research Station Report GTR-INT-288.

A second event was the Elk Vulnerability Symposium held in Bozeman in 1991. Among other things, this symposium initiated some clarification of the complex situation involving elk and their

habitats during the hunting season. Cliff Youmans (1991) presented summary data from the Bitterroot National Forest showing increasing road access and increasing bull harvest until the numbers of bulls available began to decline.

Leptich and Zager (1991) showed us that bull mortality rates in Idaho were directly related to access, and more importantly, that a bull elk in a roaded area has virtually no probability of surviving to age 5. The result, predictably, was a reduction in age structure.

Even so, roads are not the whole answer. Vales et al. (1991) presented hunter density relationships showing that shorter seasons will not protect a limited game resource. Their data indicate that any situation where hunters outnumber legal bulls is certain to produce distorted post season bull/cow ratios.

Habitat quality is also involved. In both roaded and unroaded situations Unsworth & Kuck (1991) showed some of the expected patterns - hunted elk select for heavier timber, north aspects, and steep slopes.

Hillis et al. (1991) proposed a partial solution in protecting unroaded cover patches of at least 250 acres in at least 30 percent of the elk habitat.

Lyon and Canfield (1991) confirmed that patch size becomes an important consideration for elk during the hunting season. In their western Montana study area, elk were pretty much using the habitat as it occurred, until hunting started. Thereafter, selected patches doubled in size.

Additional information is on the way. In the year since the Vulnerability Symposium, Unsworth et al. (in press) have developed a functional predictive model that uses road density, topography, and hunter intensity as input parameters. All of these studies increase our understanding of the concept of Elk vulnerability and make it possible to compare habitat effectiveness and elk vulnerability directly.

HABITAT EFFECTIVENESS: for elk

- focus on habitat loss
- based on behavior of animals
- applies to non-hunting season
- data from pellet groups and radio locations
- primarily cow elk

HABITAT EFFECTIVENESS: to the manager

- access control, open roads and motorized traffic
- cover modification, changes in productive potential
- security - displacement, discomfort, stress, but not death

ELK VULNERABILITY: for elk

- focus on elk mortality
- based on numerical response in population
- applies during the hunting season
- data from animals surviving or dying
- primarily bull elk

ELK VULNERABILITY: to the manager

- access control, any road or trail may be involved
- cover, availability and continuity vs quality
- security affects mortality, timing and rate

The implications of these relationships are hard to ignore. Habitat effectiveness is a measure of the ability of habitats to produce and sustain elk during the summer. Habitat in this context is the land managers' responsibility. And, because 80-90 percent of all elk in the United States spend time on the National Forests, habitat effectiveness has been identified in many Forest plans.

The equivalent responsibility at the state level has been regulation management, specifically, law enforcement and setting population size and structure. In Montana, these goals for every elk herd in the state have been identified in a strategic plan.

Having managed a productive habitat and filled it with elk, federal and state responsibilities begin to merge in vulnerability management. This includes any action designed to improve the chances of a bull elk surviving the hunting season. It is a shared responsibility that cannot be ignored because it cannot be managed by either federal or state action independently. Access control, habitat security, and special regulations all play a part, and they cannot be viewed as actions to be taken independently. It's imperative that game departments and the National Forests recognize all aspects of elk management and work in coordination to satisfy a demonstrated public demand.

LITERATURE CITED

- Hillis, J. Michael, Michael J. Thompson, Jodie E. Canfield, L. Jack Lyon, C. Les Marcum, Patricia M. Dolan and David W. McCleerey. 1991. Defining elk security: The Hillis paradigm. pp.38-54. A.G. Christensen, L.J. Lyon and T.N. Lonner, comps., Proc. Elk Vulnerability Symposium, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT. 330 p.

- Leptich, David J. and Peter Zager. 1991. Road access management effects on elk mortality and population dynamics. pp.126-131 in A.G. Christensen, L.J. Lyon and T.N. Lonner, comps., Proc. Elk Vulnerability Symposium, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT. 330 p.
- Lyon, L. Jack and Jodie E. Canfield. 1991. Habitat selections by Rocky Mountain elk under hunting season stress. pp.99-105 in A.G. Christensen, L.J. Lyon and T.N. Lonner, comps., Proc. Elk Vulnerability Symposium, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT. 330 p.
- Unsworth, J.W., and L. Kuck. 1991. Bull elk vulnerability in the Clearwater drainage of north-central Idaho. pp.85-88 in A.G. Christensen, L.J. Lyon and T.N. Lonner, comps., Proc. Elk Vulnerability Symposium, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT. 330 p.
- Unsworth, J.W., L. Kuck, M.D. Scott and E.O. Garton. in press. Elk mortality in the Clearwater drainage of north-central Idaho. J. Wildl. Manage. (submitted)
- Vales, David J., Victor L. Coggins, Pat Matthews and Robert A. Riggs. 1991. Analyzing options for improving bull:cow ratios of Rocky Mountain elk populations in northeast Oregon. pp. 174-181 in A.G. Christensen, L.J. Lyon and T.N. Lonner, comps., Proc. Elk Vulnerability Symposium, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT. 330 p.
- Youmans, Clifton C. 1991. Analysis of long-term trends in elk vulnerability on the Bitterroot National Forest in relation to selected predictor variables. pp.159-167 in A.G. Christensen, L.J. Lyon and T.N. Lonner, comps., Proc. Elk Vulnerability Symposium, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT. 330 p.

THE REINTRODUCTION OF GRAY WOLVES TO YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK AND CENTRAL IDAHO

EDWARD E. BANGS, Project Leader, Gray Wolf EIS, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 100 N. Park, Suite 320, Helena, Montana 59601

STEVEN H. FRITTS, Northwest U.S. Wolf Coordinator, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 100 N. Park, Suite 320, Helena, Montana 59601

Wolf Eradication- Wolves were once one of the most widely distributed land mammals on earth. In North America, gray wolves (*Canis lupus*) historically occurred in almost every habitat north of what is now Mexico City. However, as European settlers decimated wild ungulate populations and replaced them with livestock, wolves and other large predators that occasionally attacked livestock were persecuted. In addition to the real and perceived conflicts with livestock, old world myths had portrayed wolves as evil and satanic, thus it is not surprising that most people during the settlement era viewed wolves in an extremely negative context. Wolf persecution and eradication were relentless and conducted with almost hysterical zeal. Wolves were not just shot, trapped, and poisoned but burned alive, dragged behind horses, and mutilated. By 1930, government predator eradication programs eliminated wolf populations from the western United States. Similar attitudes resulted in the elimination of wolf populations from the southern portions of the western Canadian provinces by the 1950's. The fact that these events happened within the lives and recent memories of many older western residents strongly affects the social and political climate of wolf recovery efforts today.

Natural Wolf Recovery- In the 1960's, after scientific wildlife research began to dispel many of the negative myths surrounding predators, the first calls for reintroduction of wolves to Yellowstone National Park were made. About the same time, Canadian wildlife management agencies took steps to encourage re-establishment of wolf populations in parts of southern British Columbia and Alberta by eliminating bounties and restricting wolf hunting and trapping. Throughout the 1960's and 1970's lone wolves were occasionally sighted or killed in the northern Rocky Mountains of Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming (Weaver 1978, Ream and Mattson 1982). While Canadian wolf populations continued to expand southward, it was not until 1986 (55 years after eradication) that wolves again produced pups in the western United States (Ream et al. 1989). By 1993 the wolf population in northwestern Montana had increased to about 50 wolves in 5 packs. No wolf packs have been documented in other areas of the western United States, although lone wolves continued to be reported in Wyoming, Idaho, and other areas.

In 1988, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) established a proactive interagency wolf recovery program to

assist natural recolonization in Montana (Bangs 1991). The program strongly emphasized public education and information, because controversy over wolves and their management was still largely a issue of symbolism, with strong emotion, rumor, and myth on both "sides" of the wolf recovery issue and illegal killing by the public was the single greatest threat to wolf recovery in Montana. Since 1989, Service biologists have given over 300 presentations to livestock, hunter, environmental, and civic groups that were attended by over 13,000 local residents. In addition, the Service helped generate hundreds of newspaper, television, and magazine articles that provided information about wolves and their recovery to the public. Other Service-led interagency wolf recovery programs were established in Idaho, Wyoming, and Washington and are primarily focused on wolf monitoring and information and education efforts (Fritts et al. 1993).

Since 1980, conflicts with livestock production have been minor, although still extremely controversial (Bangs et al. 1993). A total of 17 cattle and 12 sheep have been killed by wolves, all in Montana. Seventeen wolves were moved or killed by the Service and USDA Animal Damage Control to prevent further livestock losses and build local tolerance of non-depredating wolves (the majority of the wolf population). In 1987, a private group (Defenders of Wildlife) established a successful program that compensates ranchers for livestock killed by wolves (about \$10,000 has been paid to date). In 1993, they began a program that pays \$5,000 to any landowner who has wolves successfully raise pups on their private property. Effective agency control of problem wolves and the private compensation program has helped reduce local controversy about the presence of wolves.

The Service, other cooperators, and the University of Montana initiated research on wolves and ungulates in and adjacent to Glacier National Park. Wolves in the Glacier Park area generally lived in packs of 8-12 wolves, utilized territories of about 300 mi² in valley bottoms, had a single litter of 6 pups in late April, fed primarily on white-tailed deer, and died most often because people killed them. Data indicate that wolves are simply another predator. Of 120 adult female white-tailed deer, elk, and moose monitored with radio telemetry over the past 4 years in that area, 45 have died. Mountain lions killed 14, wolves 10, grizzly bears 7, humans 7, coyotes 3, old age 1, and 3 others died from unknown causes (D. Pletscher, Univ. of Montana, pers. commun.). Those results led to research on mountain lions in 1992. That work suggested that wolves may be a more direct competitor with them than previously believed. Wolves have killed 3 mountain lions and it was not uncommon for wolves to track lions and usurp their ungulate kills (M. Hornocker, Hornocker Wildl. Res. Inst. Inc., pers. commun.). These data suggest the potential impact of wolves on ungulate populations may be lower than previously predicted.

Recovery Plans- In 1974, wolves were legally protected by the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Act) and recovery programs were initiated in the northern Rocky Mountains (Fritts 1991, Fritts et al. 1993). The state of Montana led an interagency recovery team, established by the Service, that developed a recovery plan for the Northern Rocky Mountain Wolf. That 1980 plan recommended a combination of natural recovery and reintroduction be used to recover wolf populations in the area around Yellowstone National Park north to the Canadian border.

A revised recovery plan was approved by the Service in 1987. It identified a recovered wolf population as being at least 10 breeding pairs of wolves, for 3 consecutive years, in each of 3 recovery areas (northwestern Montana, central Idaho and the Yellowstone area). This totals approximately 300 wolves. The plan recommended using the 1982 experimental population section (10j) of the Act to quickly reintroduce wolves to Yellowstone National Park and to conduct liberal management to address local concerns about their potential negative impacts. If 2 wolf packs had not been discovered in central Idaho within 5 years, a similar reintroduction would occur there also.

Wolf Management Committee- In 1990, Congress directed appointment of a Wolf Management Committee, composed of 3 Federal, 3 State and 4 special interest group representatives, to develop a plan for wolf restoration to Yellowstone and central Idaho. That Committee provided a majority, but not unanimous, recommendation to Congress in May 1991. That recommendation included a declaration by Congress directing reintroduction of wolves to Yellowstone National Park, and possibly central Idaho, as a special nonessential experimental population with particularly liberal management by agencies and the public to resolve potential conflicts. Wolves and ungulates under that plan would be intensively managed by the States with Federal funding and thus implementation costs were estimated to be high. Congress took no action on the Committee's recommendation.

Gray Wolf EIS- In November 1991, Congress directed the Service, in consultation with the National Park Service and Forest Service, to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS), that considered a broad range of alternatives on wolf reintroduction to Yellowstone National Park and central Idaho. In 1992, Congress directed the Service to complete the EIS by January 1994 and stated it expected the preferred alternative to be consistent with existing law.

The Service formed and funded an interagency team to prepare the EIS. In addition to the National Park Service and Forest Service, the states of Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana, USDA Animal Damage Control, and the Wind River Tribes participated. The Gray Wolf EIS program emphasized public participation. In the spring of 1992, nearly 2,500 groups or individuals that had previously expressed an interest in wolves were directly contacted and the EIS program was widely publicized.

In April 1992, a series of 27 "issue scoping" open houses were held in Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho and 7 more in other

locations throughout the U.S. The meetings were attended by nearly 1,800 people and thousands of brochures were distributed. Nearly 4,000 people provided their thoughts on issues they felt should be addressed in the EIS. The most commonly mentioned issues involved ecosystem completeness, land use restrictions, livestock losses, humane treatment and respect of wolves, potential impacts to ungulate populations and hunting opportunity, and management strategies and costs. A report describing the public's comments was mailed to 16,000 people in July.

In August 1992, another series of 27 "alternative scoping" open houses and 3 hearings were held in Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho. Three other hearings were held in Seattle, WA, Salt Lake City, UT, and Washington D.C. In addition, a copy of the alternative scoping brochure was inserted into a Sunday edition of the two major newspapers in Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho (total circulation about 250,000). Nearly 2,000 people attended the meetings and nearly 5,000 comments were received about different ways that wolf recovery could be managed. The public comment reflected the strong polarization that has typified management of wolves. A majority (many urban or not living in the potentially affected areas) indicated it wanted immediate reintroduction and full protection of wolves. Many others (primarily rural residents in or near central Idaho or Yellowstone) indicated they did not want wolves to be recovered. A report on the public's ideas and suggestions was mailed to about 30,000 people in November 1992. In April 1993, a Gray Wolf EIS planning update report was published. It discussed the status of the EIS, provided factual information about wolves, and requested the public to report observations of wolves in the northern Rocky Mountains. It was mailed to nearly 40,000 people, residing in all 50 states and over 40 foreign countries that had requested information.

Reintroduction of Wolves designated as Nonessential Experimental Populations- The draft EIS was released to the public on July 1, 1993. The Service proposed to reintroduce gray wolves into both Yellowstone National Park and central Idaho, if 2 naturally occurring wolf packs could not be located in either area before October 1994 (Fig. 1). The reintroduced wolves would be designated as nonessential experimental populations. The experimental rules would allow liberal management of wolves by government agencies and the public to minimize conflicts over public lands, effects on domestic animals and livestock, and impacts on ungulate populations. There would be no land use restrictions for wolves. State and tribal wildlife agencies would be encouraged to lead wolf management outside national parks and national wildlife refuges. Reintroduction would result in wolf population recovery in and around Yellowstone National Park and central Idaho by 2002. Total management costs of the program through recovery (10 breeding pairs in each area for 3 years) and delisting were about \$6 million.

In the draft EIS, the Service considered 4 alternatives to

the proposed action including "Natural Recovery" (wolf recovery about 2025 and total cost about \$10-\$15 million), "No Wolf" (no recovery and cost about \$100,000), "Wolf Management Committee" (recovery about 2015 and cost of \$100-\$129 million), "Reintroduction of Nonexperimental Wolves" (recovery about 2000 and total cost of \$28 million, including habitat purchases). The impact of each wolf management strategy (except the "No wolf") on livestock, ungulate populations, hunting, land use restrictions, visitor use, and local economies varied primarily in when and where the impacts would occur rather than major differences in the level of impacts.

The Yellowstone area is about 25,000 mi² (64,750 km²) and 76% federal land. This area has over 95,000 ungulates with a hunter harvest of 14,314 ungulates, is grazed by about 412,000 livestock (estimated current annual losses 21,333 head), receives about 14,500,000 recreational visits annually, and has a \$4.2 billion local economy (3.5% due to livestock). The central Idaho area is about 20,700 mi² (53,613 km²) and is nearly all USDA Forest Service land. The central Idaho area has about 241,000 ungulates with a hunter harvest of 33,358 ungulates, is grazed by about 306,525 livestock (estimated current annual losses 21,680 head), receives about 8,000,000 recreational visits annually, and has a \$1.43 billion local economy (5.2% due to livestock).

A recovered wolf population in the Yellowstone area would be anticipated to kill about 19 cattle (1-32) and 68 sheep (17-110) and up to 1,200 ungulates (primarily elk) each year. A recovered wolf population would not affect hunter harvest of male ungulates but may reduce hunter harvests of female elk, deer, and moose for some herds. A recovered wolf population would not affect hunter harvests or populations of bighorn sheep, mountain goats or antelope. A recovered wolf population may reduce populations of elk 5%-30% (30% in some small herds), deer 3%-19%, moose 7%-13%, and bison up to 15%. The presence of wolves would not change uses of public or private land except for restricting potential use of M-44 cyanide devices ("coyote getters") in occupied wolf range. Visitor use would increase (+5% for out of state residents and +10% for local residents), and generate \$7-10 million in additional net economic benefits each year.

A recovered wolf population in the central Idaho area would kill about 10 cattle (1-17) and 57 sheep (32-92) and up to 1,650 ungulates (primarily mule deer) each year. A recovered wolf population would not affect hunter harvest of male elk but may reduce harvest of female elk 10%-15%. A recovered wolf population would not measurably impact hunter harvest of deer, moose, bighorn sheep, or mountain goats. A recovered wolf population would not measurably impact ungulate populations in central Idaho. Wolf presence would not change uses of public or private land (except for restricting use of M-44 devices in occupied wolf range). Visitor use would likely increase (+8% for out of state residents and +2% for local residents), and generate \$5.6-\$8.4 million in additional net economic benefits each year.

Public comment on the draft EIS- Nearly 1,700 copies of the draft EIS and 75,000 copies of the summary draft EIS were distributed in July, August, September, and October of 1993. A copy of the summary draft EIS, a schedule for 16 public hearings (4 each in Montana, Idaho and Wyoming and 4 national) and a request to the public to report observations of wolves in the northern Rocky Mountains was incorporated into a newspaper insert that was distributed in a Sunday edition of the 2 major newspapers in Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho (circulation 270,000). Public comments on the draft EIS were accepted until November 26, 1993. Over 160,000 comments were received and analyzed, a record for public comment on a federal EIS.

Preparing the final EIS A final EIS will be completed in early 1994. Once the EIS is completed it will be forwarded to decision makers in the Service and Department of Interior. They will determine how wolf recovery will proceed. All requests for information or to receive the final EIS should be directed to Ed Bangs, **Gray Wolf EIS, P.O. Box 8017, HELENA, MONTANA 59601 or phone (406)449-5202**. The only prediction that is considered absolutely safe is that extreme controversy will continue to characterize wolves and wolf management for many years to come.

Suggested Reading about Wolves in the West:

Bangs, E. 1991. Return of a predator: wolf recovery in Montana. *Western Wildlands* 17:7-13.

Bangs E.E., S.H. Fritts, D.R. Harms, J.A. Fontaine, M.D. Jimenez, W.G. Brewster, and C.C. Niemeyer. 1993. Control of Endangered Gray Wolves in Montana. Proc. 2nd N. Am. Wolf Symposium, Edmonton, Alberta. In Press.

Fritts, S.H. 1991. Wolf and wolf recovery efforts in the northwestern United States. *Western Wildlands* 17:2-6.

Fritts, S.H., E.E. Bangs, J.A. Fontaine, W.G. Brewster, and J.F. Gore. 1993. Restoring wolves to the northern Rocky mountains of the United States. Proc. 2nd N. Am. Wolf Symposium, Edmonton, Alberta. In Press.

Ream, R.R. and U.I. Mattson. 1982. Wolf Status in the northern Rockies. Pages 362-381 in F.H. Harrington, and P.C. Paquet, eds. *Wolves of the World: perspectives of behavior, ecology, and conservation*. Noyes Publ. Park Ridge, NJ.

Ream, R.R., M.W. Fairchild, D.K. Boyd, and A.J. Blakesley. 1989. First wolf den in western U.S. in recent history. *NW. Naturalist* 70:39-40.

Weaver, J. 1978. *The Wolves of Yellowstone*. Research report 14. National Park Service, Yellowstone National Park, WY.

THE EFFECT OF POOL REGULATION ON AQUATIC MACROPHYTES AND WATERFOWL IN MADISON RESERVOIR

JON H. JOURDONNAIS, Montana Power Company, 40 East Broadway,
Butte, MT 59701

FRANK J. PICKETT, Montana Power Company, 40 East Broadway, Butte,
MT 59701

BRENT MABBOT, Montana Power Company, 40 East Broadway, Butte, MT
59701

TIM SCHULTZ, Montana Power Company, 40 East Broadway, Butte, MT
59701

From 1988-1992 we conducted field studies and compiled the recorded and anecdotal history of macrophyte and waterfowl trends in Madison Reservoir since 1932, to establish baseline information on the abundance and distribution of submerged macrophytes in response to water level regulation, and on utilization of the reservoir by various species of waterfowl. From 1932 to 1979, annual Madison Reservoir drawdowns varied in depth and duration and the reservoir was dominated by several *Potamogeton* species. In 1979, an aggressive nuisance species, *Elodea*, began to grow in the reservoir; and by the fall of 1982, *Elodea* had crowded out *Potamogeton* and become the dominant macrophyte species. A six-foot drawdown during the spring of 1983 effectively eliminated *Elodea* from the shallow portions of the reservoir. However, several *Potamogeton* species persisted and rapidly expanded in the reservoir following the 1983 drawdown. By 1988, *Elodea* was again observed growing in small numbers among *Potamogeton* species which dominated the reservoir. By late summer of 1991, *Elodea* was dominant in 76% of all reservoir plots sampled. The severe reduction in macrophyte standing biomass (primarily *Elodea*) after the 1983 drawdown was a probable factor in the decline of various migrant waterfowl using the reservoir from 1984-1991.