Mount St. Helens Elk Population Assessment: 2009-2013

March 2014

S. M. McCorquodale, P. J. Miller, S. M. Bergh, E. W. Holman

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mount St. Helens Elk Population Assessment:
2009-2013

Prepared By:
Scott McCorquodale, Pat Miller, Stefanie Bergh, Eric Holman

March 2014

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
600 Capitol Way North
Olympia, WA 98501-1091

This Program Receives Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration, Project W-96-R, Game Surveys.

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES .................................................................................................................. ii
LIST OF FIGURES ................................................................................................................. iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ........................................................................................................ viii
INTRODUCTION ...................................................................................................................... 1
STUDY AREA AND BACKGROUND .......................................................................................... 3
Elk Habitat ............................................................................................................................. 10
Overwinter Elk Mortality ....................................................................................................... 12
Elk Population Management ................................................................................................. 14
METHODS ............................................................................................................................. 16
Marking and Handling .......................................................................................................... 16
Body Condition and Reproduction ....................................................................................... 17
Sightability-Correction Modeling ........................................................................................ 18
Mark-Resight ....................................................................................................................... 23
Recruitment and Population Growth Rate .......................................................................... 25
Survival ................................................................................................................................. 26
Elk Hoof Disease .................................................................................................................. 27
Environmental and Temporal Effects ................................................................................... 28
RESULTS ............................................................................................................................... 30
Capture and Marking ............................................................................................................. 30
Late-Winter Condition and Fertility ..................................................................................... 32
Fall Body Condition ............................................................................................................. 35
Sightability Modeling .......................................................................................................... 38
Mark-Resight ....................................................................................................................... 49
Rate of Increase and Method Contrast ................................................................................ 60
Recruitment .......................................................................................................................... 62
Survival ................................................................................................................................. 64
Hoof Disease Observations ................................................................................................. 69
Environmental Effects ........................................................................................................ 70
DISCUSSION ......................................................................................................................... 75
MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS .............................................................................................. 95
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ............................................................................................................ 96
LITERATURE CITED ............................................................................................................... 98
List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of univariate association of independent variable levels and sightability of elk groups during helicopter surveys, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2011 .................................................. 39

Table 2. Results of univariate significance tests (logistic regression) for predictor variables potentially affecting sightability of elk groups during spring helicopter surveys, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2011. Bold text delineates predictors significantly related to group sightability .................................................................................. 40

Table 3. Model selection results for models predicting the sightability of elk groups from a helicopter, Mount St. Helens Elk Herd Area, 2009-2011 .................................................................................. 41

Table 4. Parameter estimates ($\beta_i$ and standard errors = SE) for the fitted sightability models from Table 3, Mount St. Helens Elk Herd, 2009-2011 .................................................................................. 42

Table 5. Model selection results for LNME mark-resight estimates of total number of elk in the 5-GMU study area, 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, WA ................................................................. 50

Table 6. Model selection results for LNME mark-resight estimates of total number of cow elk and branch-antlered bull elk in the 5-GMU study area, 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, WA ............................................................................... 52

Table 7. Estimated detection rates for radiomarked elk from the fully parameterized, sex-specific LNME mark-resight model, 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, WA.................................................... 55

Table 8. Model selection results for LNME mark-resight estimates of group-specific cow elk (5 groups = GMU) and branch-antlered bull elk (2 groups = mudflow and non-mudflow bulls), 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, WA ................................................................. 56

Table 9. Estimated detection rates for radiomarked elk from the best-supported, group-specific LNME mark-resight model, 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, WA................................. 57

Table 10. Estimated group-specific, exponential rate of increase ($r$), Mount St. Helens, WA; sightability model estimates (2009-2013); LNME mark-resight estimates (2009-2012) ................................................................................................. 60

Table 11. Model selection results for radiomarked elk survival, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013 ................................................................................................................................. 66
Table 12.
Model-averaged annual survival estimates (S-hat) and associated unconditional 95% confidence intervals for radiomarked Mount St. Helens elk for 4 survival years using the model and Akaike model weights from Table 11. All estimates are for radiomarked adult cow elk, unless specified otherwise .................. 68

Table 13.
Fates of elk with any visible hoof issue at capture among those elk radiomarked 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, WA.......................................................... 70
List of Figures

Figure 1. Map of the Mount St. Helens elk herd area (yellow outline) and the core study area (green shaded, with GMU numbers) ................................................................. 4

Figure 2. Winter snowfall was common in the study area and often persisted for several months in the higher elevation portions of the elk range each year ....................... 7

Figure 3. Cumulative daily snow depth (by month) for water years 2008-2013, from the Spirit Lake (upper panel; elevation = 1,067 m) and Pepper Creek (lower panel; elevation = 648 m) SNOTEL sites. A water year spans October 1-September 30, and is labeled by the calendar year in which it ends. ....................................................................................................................... 8

Figure 4. Cumulative spring-summer precipitation measured at the Spirit Lake SNOTEL site (elevation = 1,067 m), 2007-2012 ................................................................................................................. 9

Figure 5. Infrared satellite images of the Mount St. Helens vicinity early post-eruption (top image, 1980) and nearly 30 years post-eruption (bottom image, 2009). In these images, vegetated areas (e.g., forest, grassland, vegetated clearcuts) are red/pink, and bare ground, ash, mudflow, etc. are gray/brown (images courtesy of NASA’s Earth Observatory Program) ................................................................. 11

Figure 6. Typical corporately managed elk habitat mosaic within the core study area (GMU 550 [left] and GMU 556 [right]) ......................................................................................................................... 12

Figure 7. Number of current year overwinter elk mortalities tallied during the annual mortality survey on the Mount St. Helens Wildlife Area, April 1999-2013 ....................... 13

Figure 8. Numbers of antlerless elk permits issued, 2004-2012, for GMUs 520, 522, 524, 550, and 556, collectively ......................................................................................................................... 15

Figure 9. Numbers of antlerless elk killed, 2004-2012, in GMUs 520, 522, 524, 550, and 556, collectively ......................................................................................................................... 15

Figure 10. Elk organs from hunter-harvested cow elk used to estimate fall body fat (%IFBF) for Mount St. Helens elk, 2009-2011 (left to right: pericardium, heart, kidneys) ......................................................................................................................... 18

Figure 11. Initial delineation of counting units used for spring helicopter surveys and sightability modeling, 2009-2013, Mount St. Helens elk herd study area ..................... 19

Figure 12. Bull elk group sighted during one of the helicopter surveys; yellow arrow indicates position of a radiomarked bull in the group ............................................. 21
Figure 13. Distribution of ages for cow elk captured and radiomarked, February 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, WA ........................................... 21

Figure 14. Distribution of ages for bull elk captured and radiomarked, February 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, WA ........................................... 31

Figure 15. Boxplots of age-specific mass for cow elk captured and radiomarked, February 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, WA. Colored boxes represent the middle 50% of estimates within each age-class and heavy horizontal lines represent median values. Only a single estimated mass was available for cows aged 13, 15, and 16 ................................................................. 31

Figure 16. Boxplots for ingesta-free body fat (%IFBF) by lactation status for cow elk captured and radiomarked, February 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, WA. Colored boxes represent the middle 50% of estimates and heavy horizontal lines represent median values ........................................... 33

Figure 17. Boxplots for ingesta-free body fat (%IFBF) by pregnancy status for cow elk captured and radiomarked, February 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, WA. Colored boxes represent the middle 50% of estimates and heavy horizontal lines represent median values ........................................... 34

Figure 18. Plot of marginal means for %IFBF by GMU, controlling for pregnancy and lactation status, Mount St. Helens cow elk, 2009-2012 ................................................................. 35

Figure 19. Frequency histogram (and normal curve) for fall IFBF estimates from hunter-killed cow elk, Mount St. Helens, WA, 2009-2011 ................................................................. 36

Figure 20. Boxplots for fall %IFBF from hunter-killed elk across subareas (1 = GMU 522, 2 = GMUs 520, 524, 550, 556, 3 = GMU 560, 4 = Columbia Gorge GMUs) by lactation status, Mount St. Helens, WA, 2009-2011 ................................................................. 37

Figure 21. Sightability model estimates (± 95% CI) for total elk and total cow elk abundance in the study area, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013 ................................................................. 43

Figure 22. Sightability model estimates for total elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 520, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013 ................................................................. 44

Figure 23. Sightability model estimates for total elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 522, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013 ................................................................. 44

Figure 24. Sightability model estimates for total elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 524, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013 ................................................................. 45
Figure 25.
Sightability model estimates for total elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 550, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.......................................................... 45

Figure 26.
Sightability model estimates for total elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 556, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.......................................................... 46

Figure 27.
Sightability model estimates for cow elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 520, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.......................................................... 47

Figure 28.
Sightability model estimates for cow elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 522, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.......................................................... 47

Figure 29.
Sightability model estimates for cow elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 524, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.......................................................... 48

Figure 30.
Sightability model estimates for cow elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 550, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.......................................................... 48

Figure 31.
Sightability model estimates for cow elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 556, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.......................................................... 49

Figure 32.
Mark-resight estimates (2009-2012 = LNME; 2013 = Lincoln-Petersen) for total elk (± 95% CI) in the 5-GMU study area, 2009-2013, Mount St. Helens, WA ............ 51

Figure 33.
Mark-resight estimates (2009-2012 = LNME; 2013 = Lincoln-Petersen) for total cow elk (± 95% CI) in the 5-GMU study area, 2009-2013, Mount St. Helens, WA ....... 53

Figure 34.
Mark-resight estimates (2009-2012 = LNME; 2013 = Lincoln-Petersen) for total branch-antlered bull elk (± 95% CI) in the 5-GMU study area, 2009-2013, Mount St. Helens, WA .... 54

Figure 35.
LNME Mark-resight estimates, 2009-2012, for total cow elk (± 95% CI) in GMUs 520 and 550 (top panel); 522 and 524 (bottom panel), Mount St. Helens, WA ........... 58

Figure 36.
LNME Mark-resight estimates, 2009-2012, for total cow elk (± 95% CI) in GMU 556, Mount St. Helens, WA ......................................................... 59

Figure 37.
LNME Mark-resight estimates, 2009-2012, for total branch-antlered bull elk (± 95% CI), Mount St. Helens, WA ......................................................... 59

Figure 38.
Correlation between Sightability Model (SM) estimates and LNME mark-resight estimates for cow elk abundance, 2009-2012 (panels are, top to bottom: for first survey replicate SM estimate, second survey SM estimate, and the means of the 2 annual SM estimates) ......................................................... 61
Figure 39.
Elk calf-cow spring ratio estimates (plus 95% CI), 2009-2013, for the 5-GMU survey area, from aerial surveys, Mount St. Helens, WA ................................................................. 62

Figure 40.
GMU-specific elk calf-cow spring ratio estimates (plus 95% CI), 2009-2013, from aerial surveys, Mount St. Helens, WA ................................................................. 63

Figure 41.
GMU-specific elk calf-cow spring ratio index (observed ratio adjusted for fall antlerless harvest), 2009-2013, Mount St. Helens, WA ................................................................. 64

Figure 42.
Total radiomarked elk deaths by cause, Mount St. Helens, WA, survival years 2009-2012. Sample size of collared elk at risk at the beginning of each survival year is shown at the top of the panel ................................................................. 65

Figure 43.
Linear fits of indexed spring calf-cow ratio to late summer-fall precipitation metrics, Mount St. Helens elk herd, 2009-2013 ................................................................. 72

Figure 44.
Non-linear fit of a spring overwinter mortality index to Z-scores for late winter snow water equivalents (SWE) measured at Spirit Lake, 2008-2013 ......................... 73

Figure 45.
Linear fit of spring calf recruitment and overwinter mortality tallies to a combined index of current winter and previous late summer-fall weather severity. Marker colors: green = mild winter following normal summer; blue = normal winter and summer; yellow = normal winter and wet summer; purple = severe winter and normal summer; red = severe winter and droughty summer ......................... 74
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2009, we initiated a study of the Mount St. Helens elk population to better quantify elk abundance, develop a practical and defensible population monitoring approach, and document recent trends in elk condition, productivity, and survival. During 2009-2012, we captured and radiomarked 150 unique elk aged ≥ 1-yr-old (110 F: 40 M) by helicopter darting in a 5-Game Management Unit (GMU) study area (GMUs 520, 522, 524, 550, and 556) in the core of the Mount St. Helens elk herd area. Among the issues motivating our work were episodic high overwinter elk mortality, recent evidence of sub-par condition among elk translocated to the North Cascades in 2003 and 2005, and apparent elk herbivory impacts on plant communities in the vicinity of Mount St. Helens. In response to these issues and concurrent with the initiation of our work, antlerless elk harvesting was liberalized across several GMUs to reduce local elk densities.

Using ultrasound examination and body condition scoring we estimated mean ingesta free body fat (IFBF) for elk we live captured in February, 2009-2012, was 5.64% (95% CI = 5.08-6.21) for non-lactaters and 3.26% (95% CI = 2.34-4.18) for lactaters. These levels suggest food limitation. We found that GMU, lactation status, and pregnancy status affected IFBF, but year did not. Overall, 73 of 109 cow elk (67%) we examined for pregnancy via ultrasound were pregnant. Pregnant elk had higher IFBF than did non-pregnant elk. We also used organ samples from 364 hunter-harvested cow elk to estimate fall (Nov) IFBF for elk in the Mount St. Helens herd, 2009-2011. We detected effects of geographic subarea and lactation status on IFBF, but not effects attributable to year or cow age. IFBF was higher for cow elk harvested in GMU 560 and Columbia Gorge GMUs than from the managed forest portion of our 5-GMU study area. We estimated mean IFBF during the fall at 12.51% for non-lactaters and 10.84% for lactaters, controlling for other factors.
We collected data during intensive late winter helicopter surveys (2 complete survey replicates yearly 2009-2012, 1 survey in 2013) over the 5-GMU study area. We used data from Mar-Apr flights, 2006-2007 to fit logistic regression models to predict the sightability of elk groups based on group and environmental covariates. Several covariates influenced sightability in univariate logistic regression models. We then used multi-model inference and an information-theoretic criterion (AICc) to compare several alternative multivariate models of varying complexity; our results indicated the best multivariate model predicted sightability of elk groups based on: 1) transformed (log2) group size, and 2) forest canopy cover (%). Predicted sightability increased with increasing group size and with decreasing cover.

We also used the logit-normal mixed effects (LNME) mark-resight model to generate estimates (2009-2012) of total elk population size and the sizes of the cow and branch-antlered bull subpopulations at a variety of spatial scales. We explored 11 LNME models to estimate total population size, 10 models to estimate total subpopulation sizes for cow elk and branch-antlered bulls, and 15 models to estimate GMU-specific estimates of cow elk abundance. We also used the Lincoln-Petersen model to generate mark-resight estimates for total population size and total cow elk subpopulation size for 2013 using data from the single survey conducted that year. We again used multi-model inference and AICc to evaluate the evidence in our data for the various models in our LNME model sets.

Sightability model estimates appeared to underestimate true abundance, relative to LNME estimates. This result is common and relates to how the 2 types of models account for undetected elk. Mark-resight models are virtually always more effective at accounting for such animals. However, trend estimates from the 2 modeling approaches were relatively congruent and time-specific estimates from both approaches were highly correlated, suggesting that sightability model estimates, although biased low, provided a useful and consistent abundance
The application of a sightability modeling approach is a much more practical strategy, relative to mark-resight, for large-geographic-scale monitoring such as is needed for elk at Mount St. Helens.

Sightability model and LNME mark-resight estimates, 2009-2013, suggested a decline in overall elk abundance and cow elk abundance; bull abundance estimates indicated a relatively stable bull population. We found evidence of strong spatial variation in the decline in overall elk abundance and cow elk abundance. Estimates indicated substantial a reduction in elk abundance in GMUs 520, 524, and 550. We did not detect any decline in GMU 522 elk abundance, nor in GMU 556 abundance; however, estimated elk abundance in GMU 556 during the last survey year that we report on, spring 2013, was the lowest we recorded across the 5 years of data from GMU 556. Across our individual counting units, the units the furthest west showed the most consistent and dramatic declines in raw elk counts; units further east in the same GMUs produced more stable counts.

For virtually every geographic scale of abundance estimates for total elk and total cow elk, the 2013 point estimate was the lowest estimate obtained 2009-2013, except for GMU 522 estimates. For total elk and total cow elk across the 4-GMU landscape (excluding GMU 522), 2013 estimated abundance was on the order of 30-35% lower than the 2009 estimates. GMU-specific sightability model estimates of total elk and total cow elk abundance were on the order of 60-70% lower in 2013 than in 2009 for GMUs 520 and 550, were ~40-60% lower for GMU 524, and were ~20-25% lower for GMU 556.

We also used radiomarked elk to estimate survival rates and explore possible sources of variation in survival. We explored 15 survival models with known-fate modeling using AIC_c and model weights to draw conclusions about Mount St. Helens elk survival during 2009-2013 (4 survival years). The best model had a common cow survival parameter for GMUs 520, 522, 524, and 556 that was constant during 2009-2011, a common cow survival parameter for all GMUs
during the last survival year (2012-2013), a unique survival parameter for GMU 550 cows during 2009-2011, and constant bull survival across years. Bull elk survival was estimated to be 0.56 (95% CI = 0.43-0.68). Annual cow survival was estimated to be 0.85 (95% CI = 0.78-0.91) during 2009-2011 in GMUs 520, 522, 524, and 556. During the same years, cow survival was estimated at 0.64 (95% CI = 0.48-0.78) in GMU 550. Cow survival in the final survival year (2012-2013) was estimated to be 0.52 (95% CI = 0.38-0.65) across all 5 GMUs. Low survival of radiomarked elk, 2012-2013, corresponded to a fairly high number of unmarked, winter-killed elk (n= 71) tallied during the annual mortality survey on the mudflow. During the previous 3 years, the annual winter mortality survey yielded tallies ranging 2-46 elk.

Spring calf recruitment varied considerably during 2009-2013. Calf:cow ratios exceeded 35:100 during 2010 and 2011. Calf recruitment was lower in the spring of 2009 and much lower in 2012, 2013. Overall, observed estimates were in the 25-30:100 range for the study area and in the 25-35:100 range for most GMU-specific estimates. After attempting to correct the observed ratios for fall removals of antlerless elk via hunter harvest, calf recruitment was indexed mostly in the high teens to 100 cows range for 2012, 2013 and in the 20-30-ish calves per 100 cows in 2009. Indexed recruitment in spring 2013 was the lowest—compared to other study years—for almost all GMUs. Depressed calf recruitment in the spring of 2013 corresponded to high mortality among radiomarked elk that same year, high observed overwinter mortality of unmarked elk, and elk abundance estimates that were also low.

Spring calf recruitment, 2009-2013, was strongly related to late summer-fall precipitation metrics ($r^2 = 0.91-0.96$); calf recruitment was higher in years with significant late summer-fall moisture, presumably because of enhanced forage production/quality during the time when calf elk are becoming increasingly dependent on foraging. Overwinter elk mortality, as indexed by the annual mortality survey on the mudflow, was strongly related ($r^2 = 0.90$) to a metric
reflecting daily snowpack during mid-to-late winter; in years with substantial late winter snowpack, overwinter mortality was higher than in years with milder winter conditions.

Collectively, our estimates of elk condition, productivity, and survival indicated fairly strong food limitation in this population that may have been a function of elk density. Attempts to reduce the elk population via liberalized hunter harvest beginning in 2007 were apparently successful, based on our estimates of elk abundance. However, links between weather covariates and recruitment and survival, coupled with a substantive overwinter mortality event, 2012-2013, suggest that reducing the elk density has not eliminated the risks of overwinter mortality, at least in the short-term. It is likely that plant community responses to lower elk herbivory are still evolving and benefits likely will take some time to be fully realized. We discuss the implications of both density-dependent and density-independent influences on elk demography and management in the Mount St. Helens elk herd. Our work did not address issues surrounding elk hoof disease, as these issues were beyond our research scope. The role of hoof disease in elk population processes at Mount St. Helens remains unclear, as does the degree that the condition’s presence will complicate meeting management objectives.
INTRODUCTION

The Mount St. Helens elk herd is the largest of 10 formally recognized elk herds in Washington (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife 2008). The herd occupies a large and diverse area of lowland and mid-elevation forest, interspersed with floodplains and valley bottoms in the southwestern part of the state. The herd name derives from the presence of the Mount St. Helens volcano, located near the center of the herd area. The volcanic eruption on May 18, 1980 devastated a large area occupied by elk, killing most elk in this impacted zone. Subsequently, as habitat recovery and restoration occurred, elk recolonized most of the area affected by the eruption (Merrill et al. 1987). This elk herd provides considerable elk-centered recreation, including elk hunting and wildlife-viewing. Because of the herd’s history, because of the tourist appeal of the volcano, and because the herd area is bordered by developed corridors with sizable metropolitan populations, the Mount St. Helens elk herd is a high profile herd, featured often in local news media.

Over approximately the last 3 decades, elk habitat in areas affected by the 1980 eruption has evolved considerably, and the landscape carrying capacity for elk has been dynamic. Forage availability for elk appears to have peaked in the mid-to-late 1980s when early seral habitat was abundant and began to decline rapidly about the late 1990s as closed canopy forest conditions advanced. As habitat changed,
indications that the elk herd was becoming increasingly food-limited became evident. Among the most dramatic indicators of the change in elk habitat quality, was the appearance of substantial episodic winter mortality events that began in the late 1990s and widespread evidence of strong herbivory effects on plant communities used by elk. The winter mortality events were most apparent on the floodplain of the North Fork of the Toutle River, an area that remains substantially impacted by the 1980 volcanic lahar.

For elk management to be appropriately responsive to dynamics in the availability and quality of elk habitat requires: defensible information on elk abundance, a fundamental understanding of basic elk vital rates (i.e., mortality and productivity) and how these are affected by habitat dynamics, and how systematic changes in habitat structure and composition affect the spatial and temporal availability of elk habitat components, especially forage. Historically, surveys of elk at Mount St. Helens were focused on generating ratio data (calves:100 cows and bulls:100 cows) to monitor juvenile recruitment and bull harvest effects. Previous efforts to use these data to model elk abundance were largely unsuccessful (Miller and McCorquodale 2006). Data on Mount St. Helens elk vital rates are available from the recolonization phase dating to the 1980s (Merrill et al. 1987), but more recent estimates of elk vital rates were lacking as of the mid-2000s. In light of these data limitations, we undertook a study in 2009 to: 1) develop a practical approach to monitoring Mount St. Helens’ elk abundance; 2) generate defensible estimates (or indices) of recent and current elk abundance; and 3) evaluate physical condition and vital rates of a representative sample of elk from the population.

Our efforts focused on a subarea of the core herd range where habitat dynamics have been the most dramatic in the last 3 decades and where periodic overwinter elk mortality has been prevalent. Our work did not directly focus on documenting habitat conditions, forage availability, or herbivory because concurrent work by the Weyerhaeuser Company, researchers with the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement, and a graduate student at the University of Alberta were concurrently researching these issues.
STUDY AREA AND BACKGROUND

The Mount St. Helens elk herd area covers much of southwest Washington, east of Interstate 5 (Fig. 1), and during our work, consisted of 14 Game Management Units (GMUs) defining 5 Population Management Units (PMUs). This large area (≈ 4,710 mi²) extends north to south from almost south Puget Sound to the Columbia River Gorge and west to east from I-5 to US Highway 97 (more than 40 miles east of the Cascade Crest). The scale of the defined herd area made it impractical to serve as a formal study area, so we selected a 5 GMU core area as our study area; the GMUs we selected were: Winston (GMU 520), Loowit (GMU 522), Margaret (GMU 524), Coweeman (GMU 550), and Toutle (GMU 556) (Fig. 1). These GMUs represent a large swath of the herd’s core range, including an extensive area of industrial and state-
Figure 1. Map of the Mount St. Helens elk herd area (yellow outline) and the core study area (green shaded, with GMU numbers).
managed forest, as well as that part of the landscape still impacted by the 1980 eruption of the volcano (North Fork of the Toutle River and the Mount St. Helens National Volcanic Monument). This area has historically supported the highest elk density, much of the historic recreational elk hunting, and includes the area presenting the most complex management challenges (e.g., hunter access, elk effects on industrial forestry and plant succession, and episodic winter elk mortality on the mudflow). The exception to this spatial extent for our work was for fall sampling of organs from hunter-killed elk (see Methods below); we solicited and analyzed organ samples from additional GMUs within the herd area boundary (i.e., the Columbia Gorge and Cascade GMUs).

Physiographically, most of the herd area is within the Southern Washington Cascade Province, except for the western-most portion, which is within the Puget Trough Province (Franklin and Dyrness 1973). Elevations within the study area ranged from approximately 6 meters above mean sea level (AMSL) to 2,535 meters AMSL at the crest of the volcano. The western portion of the study area consisted of relatively flat and gently rolling terrain, whereas steep, rugged topography characterized the eastern portion. Historically, the area was covered by dense coniferous forests, but urban, suburban, and agricultural development has converted much of the lowland area into a relatively open landscape. Most of the upland foothills and mountainous terrain remain dominated by coniferous forest, much of it managed for commercial timber products. Three major forest zones occur in the study area: the western hemlock (Tsuga heterophylla), Pacific silver fir (Abies amabilis), and mountain hemlock (Tsuga mertensiana) zones (Franklin and Dyrness 1973). Douglas-fir (Pseudotsuga menziesii) is a naturally occurring co-dominant tree in the western hemlock zone, and is typically promoted in second growth forests because of the high commercial value of this fast-growing conifer. Timber harvest on industrial lands and some state lands has historically been by clearcutting. Forest management has produced a distinctive and extensive mosaic of recent clearcuts and second growth stands of various ages.

The Mount St. Helens elk herd area was dramatically transformed by the May 18, 1980 volcanic eruption that impacted 600 km² of the area north, northeast, and northwest of the crater. The eruption killed an extensive area of conifer forest and
resulted in extensive (c. 4 billion board feet) blow-down (Frenzen and Crisafulli 1990, Franklin et al. 1995). Ash, debris, and/or mudflow covered much of the blast zone initially, but vegetative recovery in less-impacted areas proceeded rapidly. However, natural recovery has been slow and incomplete in areas nearest the crater and along the North Fork of the Toutle River (Wood and Del Moral 1988, Del Moral and Wood 1988, Del Moral and Wood 1993, Del Moral 1998, Lawrence and Ripple 2000). The principal industrial forest landowner, Weyerhaeuser, was substantially impacted by the eruption due to widespread loss of high value timber. Subsequently, the company invested extensively in salvage logging and reforestation to restore its lands to production.

In the nearly 30 years between the eruption in 1980 and the beginning of our study in 2009, much of the impacted landscape has returned to the typical appearance of a western Washington managed forest landscape, with little evidence of the 1980 cataclysm. Much of this recovery was promoted by active forest management (Franklin et al. 1995). However, dramatic evidence of the eruption is still visible on the highly erosive North Fork of the Toutle River, where a large matrix of rock, gravel, and ash covers much of the floodplain, with patchy “islands” of meadow-like prairie and stands of pioneering red alder (Alnus rubra) interspersed. The headwaters of the North Fork, the pumice plain, and the flanks of the crater have remained largely untouched by post-eruption management and still bear evidence of the devastation that occurred in 1980. This area has been allowed to recover under natural processes, and in 1982, 445 km$^2$ were federally designated as the Mount St. Helens National Volcanic Monument, which is administered by the U. S. Forest Service. Some limited recreation occurs within the monument, but the natural character of the area is emphasized and protected as a management priority.

The climate of the study area is Pacific maritime, with cool, wet winters and relatively dry summers. Annual precipitation has typically ranged 160-400 cm (63-157 inches) in recent decades, with most of the annual precipitation falling between October and April. Winter snowfall is common, varies considerably across years, and at higher elevations persists for much of the winter (Fig. 2). During and just previous to our study,
cumulative daily snow depth at the Spirit Lake SNOTEL site (1,067 meters; USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service) was greatest for December 2007 and December 2012, intermediate in December 2008 and 2010, and lowest in December 2009 and December 2011 (Fig. 3). By March, cumulative daily snow depth was greatest in 2008, intermediate in 2009, 2011, 2012, and 2013, and lowest in 2010. Winter 2009-2010 was very snow-free compared to the other winters at the Spirit Lake site (Fig. 3). At a lower elevation (648 m) SNOTEL site (Pepper Creek) just south of the study area, cumulative daily snow depth in December was greatest in December 2007 and 2008, intermediate in December 2010 and 2012, and lowest in December 2009 and 2011 (Fig. 3). By March, cumulative daily snow depth at this lower site was greatest in 2008, slightly lower in 2009, intermediate in 2011, 2012, and 2013, and lowest in 2010 (Fig. 3). At the Pepper Creek SNOTEL site, the winter of 2009-2010 had little accumulated snow, whereas the winter of 2007-2008 was severe relative to snowfall.

Figure 2. Winter snowfall was common in the study area and often persisted for several months in the higher elevation portions of the elk range each year.
Figure 3. Cumulative daily snow depth (by month) for water years 2008-2013, from the Spirit Lake (upper panel; elevation = 1,067 m) and Pepper Creek (lower panel; elevation = 648 m) SNOTEL sites. A water year spans October 1 – September 30, and is labeled by the calendar year in which it ends.
Spring/summer/early fall precipitation, measured at the Spirit Lake SNOTEL site, was greatest in 2010 and 2012, lowest in 2007 (just prior to our study), and intermediate in all other years (Fig. 4). Early fall precipitation occurred in most years, but was largely absent in 2012 and minimal in 2011 (Fig. 4). Not only was 2010 the wettest summer, it was also the wettest fall, evidenced by the slope of the late August to mid-September cumulative precipitation line (Fig. 4).

Figure 4. Cumulative spring-summer precipitation measured at the Spirit Lake SNOTEL site (elevation = 1,067 m), 2007-2012.

Land ownership in the Mount St. Helens elk herd area is relatively evenly split between public and private ownership (Miller and McCorquodale 2006). Much of the forested eastern portion of the area is federally managed as part of the Gifford Pinchot National Forest and includes several formally designated wilderness areas. WDFW and
the Washington Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) also own and manage lands within the herd area. Large tracts of industrial forest dominate the western portion of the herd area occupied by elk; the Weyerhaeuser Company manages the largest area of corporate forest. The developed portions of the landscape (e.g., valley floodplains, populated corridors along Interstate 5 and the Columbia Gorge, agricultural lands) are also in private ownership. Our core study area mostly encompassed corporate forest land, but included small tracts of WDFW and WDNR lands, as well as very small parcels of other private land. The only federal land within our core study area was the Mount St. Helens National Volcanic Monument tract.

Elk Habitat

Prior to the 1980 eruption, elk habitat in the western half of the Mount St. Helens elk herd area was typical of western Washington elk habitat. Early seral habitat, preferred by foraging elk, was maintained principally by clearcut logging on private, state, and federal forests (Witmer et al. 1985). Forest management created a diverse mosaic of stand ages that served to maintain quality elk habitat at both small and large scales throughout this region (Starkey et al. 1982, Witmer et al. 1985, Jenkins and Starkey 1996). Simulation modeling suggested forage availability for elk likely peaked in the 1960s region-wide and declined through the 1970s and 1980s based on forest harvest patterns (Jenkins and Starkey 1996), but forage availability for elk at the end of this time series was still likely higher than it had been in the first half of the 20th century.

The volcanic eruption altered the habitat mosaic for elk by killing vegetation in virtually all stands, regardless of age, and across habitats in about 600 km² of southwest Washington (Fig. 5). As previously described, in the 30 years between the eruption and the beginning of our study, the managed forest mosaic was largely recreated on the landscape (Fig. 5), albeit with a truncated distribution of stand ages in the original blast zone.

The regional dynamics of elk habitat values have also been strongly affected by forest management policy across ownerships in recent decades. An emphasis on conservation of older forest conditions on federal lands led to a dramatic decline in timber harvesting about 1991 on national forests in western Washington and Oregon,
with a resultant decline in the availability of early seral stands important to elk on federal forests (Hett et al. 1978, Salwasser et al. 1993, Adams and Latta 2007). Since that time, the creation and maintenance of early seral elk habitat at larger scales has been largely limited to privately owned forests of the region (Adams and Latta 2007) (Fig. 6).

**Figure 5.** Infrared satellite images of the Mount St. Helens vicinity early post-eruption (top image, 1980), and nearly 30 years post-eruption (bottom image, 2009). In these images, vegetated areas (e.g., forest, grassland, vegetated clearcuts) are red/pink, and bare ground, ash, mudflow, etc. are gray/brown (images courtesy of NASA’s Earth Observatory Program).
Figure 6. Typical corporately managed elk habitat mosaic within the core study area (GMU 550 [left] and GMU 556 [right]).

Overwinter Elk Mortality

Since the spring of 1999, the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife has conducted a winter elk mortality survey on about 4 km² of the floodplain of the North Fork of the Toutle River where substantial overwinter mortality has been periodically observed. This survey is conducted about late April each year and consists of a team of approximately 30-40 WDFW staff and volunteers walking transects through the entire sampling area, which consists mostly of the WDFW-owned Mount St. Helens Wildlife Area. The survey is used to provide an index of annual overwinter elk mortality, not an estimate of total overwinter mortality, given the limited spatial extent of the survey. During the survey, elk mortalities observed are examined for approximate death timing (recent [days old] vs. older [weeks to months old]), a femur is sectioned to document bone marrow condition (white and firm, red and runny, or desiccated), and GPS coordinates are taken to geospatially reference the site. The cumulative GPS dataset, as well as the presence or absence of cut femurs, is used to discriminate current year mortalities from those dating to a previous year.
The numbers of winterkilled elk observed during the annual transect survey has varied considerably across years (0-158) (Fig. 7). The highest count ($n = 158$) occurred at the end of the winter prior to our study (April 2008). During our study, winterkilled elk were detected each year; very few mortalities ($n = 2$) were tallied in spring 2010, but numerous dead elk were detected in most other years. In 2013, the 71 winterkilled elk detected was the third highest count observed since the surveys began in 1999.

![Figure 7](image-url)  
**Figure 7.** Number of current year overwinter elk mortalities tallied during the annual mortality survey on the Mount St. Helens Wildlife Area, April 1999-2013.
Elk Population Management

The management history for the Mount St. Helens elk herd has been documented in detail in the Mount St. Helens Elk Herd Plan (Miller and McCorquodale 2006), including season structures, season lengths, and hunter participation levels, by GMU, in recent decades. As is typical in elk management, most recreational hunting opportunity has historically been supported by bull elk general seasons in the Mount St. Helens elk herd area. A variety of season structures have been used to manage the general bull harvest, including any bull seasons, spike-only seasons, and ≥ 3-point seasons, across years and across GMUs. To support a diversity of hunting experiences, some GMUs in the Mount St. Helens herd area have been periodically designated as permit-only elk units with no general season elk hunting.

During our study, general bull seasons (≥ 3-point) were in place in GMUs 520 and 550. Permit only seasons governed bull elk hunting in GMUs 522, 524, and 556. Also during our study, all antlerless elk hunting was by permit only seasons across our study area GMUs, except that general antlerless elk seasons for archery hunters existed in GMUs 520 and 550. Density manipulation in elk populations is typically accomplished by varying the numbers of antlerless elk permits to achieve a desired cow elk harvest. During the period from the post-eruption, elk recolonization through the mid-2000s, antlerless elk hunting in the core GMUs of the Mount St. Helens herd was managed fairly conservatively to promote population stability and/or growth, outside of areas where elk damage issues existed. In response to the overwinter elk mortality issue, however, antlerless elk permits were liberalized in 2007, and even further liberalized in 2011 (Fig. 8), to reduce the local elk density and bring it into better balance with available habitat in the herd's core GMUs (Miller and McCorquodale 2006). The liberalization of antlerless elk permitting, 2007-2012, yielded the intended increase in antlerless elk harvest (Fig. 9). Qualitatively, the elk antlerless harvest, 2004-2012, has the same step-like appearance as the antlerless elk permit levels did during the same timeframe (Figs. 8, 9), with increased harvest of antlerless elk occurring each time permit levels increased.
Figure 8. Numbers of antlerless elk permits issued, 2004-2012, for GMUs 520, 522, 524, 550, and 556, collectively.

Figure 9. Numbers of antlerless elk killed, 2004-2012, in GMUs 520, 522, 524, 550, and 556, collectively.
METHODS

Marking and Handling

We captured adult and yearling cow elk and branch-antlered bull elk by darting them with a carfentanil citrate / xylazine hydrochloride mixture from a Bell 206 Jet Ranger helicopter. Captures occurred in February each year, 2009-2012. We ear-tagged elk we captured with colored and numbered plastic livestock tags. We fit most elk with 148-150 MHz, Very High Frequency (VHF) radiocollars (Telonics [Mesa, Arizona, USA]), but some received GPS-equipped radiocollars (Telonics or Lotek [Newmarket, Ontario, Canada]). All radiocollars had motion detectors that served as mortality beacons. We extracted a single vestigial upper canine from each elk to estimate age via cementum annuli analysis (Matson’s Lab, Milltown, MT, USA), and we gave each elk a short-acting, prophylactic injection of penicillin, banamine, and an anti-clostridial to reduce risks of post-capture complications, such as dart wound infections. We also measured each elk’s chest girth with a flexible tape measure to later estimate body mass. After handling, we reawakened immobilized elk via injections of the narcotic reversal, naltrexone hydrochloride and the xylazine reversal, yohimbine
hydrochloride. After we administered reversal drugs, elk were generally alert and ambulatory within 1-7 minutes.

**Body Condition and Reproduction**

We estimated late winter (mid-February) ingesta-free body fat (IFBF) percentage from data we collected for adult cow elk during each capture event. We collected data and generated IFBF estimates following Cook et al. (2010). The basic data were: 1) body mass (kg; estimated via chest girth), 2) maximum subcutaneous rump fat depth (cm; measured using a portable ultrasound unit), and 3) a palpated body condition score (BCS = 0-5) measured at the rump (i.e., prominence of sacral ridge and prominence of the sacro-sciatic ligament) (Cook et al. 2010). We also determined pregnancy status for each captured cow elk via ultrasound and visually examined and palpated each elk’s udder to verify their lactation status: non-lactater (dry), true lactater (milk), or post-lactater (clear fluid).

We also quantified yearling and adult cow elk body condition during fall, 2009-2011, using modified Kistner subset scoring (Kistner et al. 1980, Cook et al. 2001b) applied to internal organs collected from hunter-killed elk. We visually scored (i.e., 1-20) the extent of organ fat deposition associated with the heart, pericardium, and kidneys (Fig. 10) using standardized reference photos and calculated an estimated IFBF for each sampled cow elk using the equations of Cook et al. (2001b). We solicited these organs from antlerless-elk permit holders each year via mail requests and field contacts; hunters were asked to deposit organ samples at several collection stations we established each fall across our study area. Hunters were also asked to submit 2 middle incisors from their harvested elk for age determination via cementum annuli examination (Matson’s Lab, Milltown, MT); they were also asked to report observed lactation status (i.e., udder was dry, had milk, or had clear fluid). Organ samples were frozen promptly after field retrieval for subsequent scoring each winter at the Cowlitz Wildlife Area Headquarters. Scoring was done each year on a single day using a team-scoring approach to maximize scoring consistency within and across years.
Sightability-Correction Modeling

We developed and evaluated sightability correction models for late winter-early spring helicopter surveys in our 5-GMU core study area by collecting data from sighted and unsighted groups of radiomarked elk, Mar-Apr 2009-2011. We initially delineated 19 sampling units that were 16.8-62.7 (mean = 31.0) km² (Fig. 11). We selected sampling unit sizes such that a unit could generally be flown without having to refuel the helicopter, except for the mudflow unit (GMU 522). Two units never contained a radiomarked elk and also yielded very few unmarked elk observations, so we rarely flew these units because of a low benefit-to-cost ratio. For all other units, we flew each twice per winter during weeklong survey periods that were separated by 1-2 weeks, providing spatial and temporal replication.

We verified the distribution of radiomarked elk among our sampling units prior to a survey by flying just off the perimeter of each unit with the telemetry-equipped survey helicopter, being careful to not gain specific information about the location of elk within the units. Crews conducted initial visual surveys and telemetry-assisted follow-up in each sampling unit from a Bell 206 Jet Ranger helicopter. The crew of the survey helicopter generally had information on the distribution of radiomarked elk among counting units, but did not know the exact locations of these elk. We flew adjacent units consecutively where movement of elk across sampling unit boundaries was anticipated, based on previous telemetry data. The helicopter crew consisted of the pilot and 3
Figure 11. Initial delineation of counting units used for spring helicopter surveys and sightability modeling, 2009-2013, Mount St. Helens elk herd study area.
observers. The primary observer sat abreast the pilot and also recorded data; the 2 additional observers sat abreast, in the back seat of the aircraft. One backseat observer assisted in navigation and maintaining flight line protocols by following a GPS track log on a laptop computer. The helicopter was equipped with a single, forward-looking VHF telemetry antenna and a receiver that allowed radiomarked elk to be relocated and/or identified when needed during the data collection flights, as described below.

We conducted visual surveys of the counting units initially with the helicopter’s telemetry system inactivated. We surveyed the counting units at an altitude of 40-70 m above-ground-level (AGL), flying at 80-120 km/hr. Because of the extensive size of the defined survey area, it was impractical to systematically survey the entire area with evenly spaced flight transects, as is typical for sightability surveys (Samuel et al. 1987, McCorquodale et al. 2013). Because a substantial part of the survey area was typified by habitat with predictably low elk sightability (e.g., high canopy closure regeneration stands and older conifer forest), our approach focused on flying a high proportion of the landscape where elk detection probabilities would be expected to be modest to high (e.g., clearcuts, young regeneration stands, leafless alder stands). In this way, we maximized efficiency by flying where we had some real chance of seeing elk and avoiding areas where sighting elk was very unlikely. This strategy was based on a fundamental goal of maximizing our ability to count as many elk as possible in the survey area, within the constraints of available time and financial resources.

The helicopter crew scanned for elk groups out of both sides of the helicopter. When a crewmember sighted an elk group, the pilot deviated from the flight line and circled the group while the crew collected the following covariate data: group size (GRP), activity of the first elk sighted (ACT: bedded, standing, or moving), percent canopy closure characterizing the area immediately around the group (CAN), percent snow cover (SNOW), cover type (COV) as a categorical variable (opening, clearcut, regenerating conifer stand, alder, conifer forest, or mixed hardwood/conifer forest), and lighting (LIGHT: flat vs. bright). The crew had graphical depictions of various canopy
closure settings available for reference. We recorded CAN and SNOW as quantitative covariates, in increments of 5%. We also recorded GPS waypoints for all elk groups.

Crews also scrutinized sighted groups for the presence of radiomarked elk (Fig. 12) and recorded the composition of the groups (i.e., the numbers of adult cows, calves, yearling bulls, subadult bulls [raghorns = 2-3 yr-olds], and mature bulls [robust antlers ≥4 yr-olds]). If radiomarked elk were sighted in a group, the telemetry system was activated, and the crew identified all radiomarked elk present. We took digital photos of larger groups (≥ 30 elk) and later verified group size and composition from these photos. After we collected data for each sighted group, we deactivated the telemetry system if it had been used to identify collared elk, the pilot repositioned the helicopter back onto the original flight line, and we resumed the survey protocol.

Figure 12. Bull elk group sighted during one of the helicopter surveys; yellow arrow indicates position of a radiomarked bull in the group.
When we had finished surveying a counting unit and had collected data for all sighted groups, we reactivated the telemetry system aboard the helicopter to facilitate locating elk groups containing radiomarked elk that we had missed during the visual survey. We located all missed radiomarked elk precisely via telemetry and collected the same data for these groups that we had collected for sighted groups. When these missed groups were located in heavy cover, the pilot homed to the radio signal and maneuvered the aircraft in low concentric circles over the radiomarked elk’s location while the crew carefully watched for elk movement. Often, the pilot was able to haze these groups into sparser cover where the crew could enumerate and classify them. Sometimes, groups in the heaviest cover could not be completely counted or estimated with confidence, and these instances resulted in missing data for the GRP covariate. We also recorded GPS waypoints for all groups that had been missed, but were subsequently located via telemetry.

We modeled the sighting process as a binary response (i.e., 1 = sighted group, 0 = missed group) using logistic regression (Hosmer and Lemeshow 1989), employing group and environmental covariates as potential predictor variables. Modeling was based only on radiomarked groups (i.e., we recorded data from sighted groups that did not contain radiomarked elk, but did not use those data to model sightability). For groups that had missing values for the GRP covariate, we substituted the median group size from all groups we had confidently counted, but limited the data to groups missed in forested habitats (elk groups on the mudflow tended to be larger than groups observed in forested uplands). We also evaluated a transformed GRP covariate (LG2GRP = log2[GRP]) because we thought it was more reasonable for the effect (i.e., odds ratio) of group size to be constant as group size doubled rather than as it increased by 1 elk across an array of group sizes. For modeling sightability, we also derived a covariate reflecting the dominant gender of the group (SEX). We initially used univariate logistic regression (i.e., models with only an intercept and a single predictor variable) to identify which predictors were systematically related to the sighting trial outcome (sighted vs. missed). We also tested for collinearity among predictors. We then brought forward those predictor variables that were related to sightability and
conceptualized several alternative models of varying complexity reflecting logical combinations of covariates potentially affecting the sightability of elk groups during helicopter surveys. Where collinearity existed among covariates, we selected one covariate for inclusion in the multivariable models. We used Akaike’s Information Criterion, adjusted for small samples (AICc) to assess model support and used model averaging to derive final coefficient estimates and their unconditional standard errors (Burnham and Anderson 2002).

In the spring of 2012 and again in 2013 we flew our surveys as we had done during 2009-2011, except that we ceased to relocate missed radiomarked elk, and we flew only 1 survey session in 2013; therefore, we did not use data from sighted groups in 2012 and 2013 as sightability modeling data because it was inappropriate to include data that could only come from sighted groups. We subsequently used the data collected for sighted groups only for all years, 2009-2013, to generate estimates of population size using the best-supported sightability model. These data included the data used to develop the sightability model (i.e., 2009-2011) and non-model-building data (i.e., 2012-2013). We derived abundance estimates and their 95% confidence intervals using the R (R Core Development Team 2008) package Sightability Model, following Fieberg (2012). We generated estimates of total elk abundance from each survey replicate, as well as separate estimates for adult cow abundance. We generated these estimates for both the full 5-GMU landscape and for each of the 5 GMUs separately. To estimate abundance, we used only data from the survey units we flew on every survey replicate (i.e., we omitted data from the 2 units described above that were flown only occasionally).

Mark-Resight

Among available mark-resight estimators that are robust to heterogeneity of resighting probabilities across individuals within resighting occasions, we chose the maximum-likelihood based logit-normal mixed effects (LNME) model (McClintock et al. 2008). The likelihood for the LNME model formally estimated population size ($N_j$); it also generated MLEs for detection probability ($p_{ij}$) and the variance ($\sigma^2_{ij}$) of a random
individual heterogeneity effect, where the subscript $j$ refers to primary occasions (year) and $i$ to secondary occasions (survey) within a primary occasion (McClintock et al. 2008). In the absence of individual heterogeneity, the parameter $p_{ij}$ is interpreted as the overall mean detection probability, but when heterogeneity > 0, overall mean detection probability is estimated under the LNME model as the derived parameter $\mu$ (McClintock 2008), which we report. The parameter $\mu$ is derived as a function of $p_{ij}$, $\sigma_j^2$, and $\alpha_{ij}$ (number of marked animal encounters, where identity was not determined).

We implemented the LNME model in Program MARK (White and Burnham 1999), which allowed us to compare alternative model parameterizations that embodied hypotheses about sources of variability affecting LNME abundance estimates (McCorquodale et al. 2013). We coded 3 separate encounter history datasets for the LNME analysis: the first dataset was coded with a single marked animal group (i.e., marked cows and bulls were pooled), the second dataset was coded such that marked cows and marked branch-antlered bulls were different groups, and the third dataset was coded with 7 groups: cow elk according to which of the 5 GMUs they occupied and bull elk relative to whether they occupied the mudflow or forested upland units. The single marked group dataset facilitated estimating total elk abundance, the 2-group dataset supported formal estimates of the subpopulations of the total number of adult cows and total number of branch-antlered bulls, and the 7-group dataset supported estimating GMU-specific abundance of cow elk and setting-specific abundance of branch-antlered bulls (mudflow vs. managed forest).

We developed a candidate model set for each analysis that consisted of 11 models for the 1-group dataset, 10 models for the 2-group dataset, and 15 models for the 7-group dataset. Alternative model parameterizations reflected different model constraints on detection probabilities and individual heterogeneity effects. Our models included possible temporal effects that we believed might be logically related to our survey results. For the recapture (resighting) probability ($p_i$), we contemplated models with no temporal variation ($.$), models wherein the first and second survey sessions across years were represented by a unique recapture probabilities, and models where we assumed various year-specific effects on recapture probabilities. These temporal
effects models were based on potential influences of winter severity on detectability and on our experiences that generally suggested that detectability of elk was better the later into the spring that we flew. We used Akaike’s Information Criterion, adjusted for small samples ($AIC_c$) and Akaike model weights ($w_i$) to make inference about the best supported models among our candidate models (Burnham and Anderson 2002), and we averaged across models to derive final abundance estimates.

The data collection described in the methodology for sightability-correction modeling (above) provided the essential data for our mark-resight analyses. The necessary data elements included the enumeration and sex/age classification of all elk within groups encountered during the visual portion of the experimental helicopter surveys and an accounting of the distribution of radiomarked elk among these groups (including identity of radiomarked elk). Our mark-resight analyses were based on 2 replicated surveys of the core study area each winter.

We compared sightability model estimates to LNME mark-resight estimates by estimating Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient using GMU-specific annual abundance estimates from both approaches for adult cows.

Recruitment and Population Growth Rate

We assessed annual calf recruitment at the approximate end-of-winter by estimating the ratio of calves to 100 cows, a standard metric for juvenile recruitment. At the study area and GMU scales, we estimated the annual ratios and associated confidence intervals for years with 2 replicate surveys following Skalski et al. (2005) for sampling with replacement and following Skalski et al. (2005) for 2013 data (1 survey) for sampling without replacement. Fall antlerless elk harvest will affect calf:cow ratios estimated the following spring because animals have potentially been removed from both the numerator (calves) and denominator (cows). This is expected to be particularly problematic under liberal antlerless harvest, as was occurring during our study. Typically, most antlerless elk harvest consists of yearling and older cows (WDFW, unpublished data), and under this scenario, spring calf:cow ratios would tend towards overestimation, relative to the actual ratios that would be observed in the absence of harvest. We attempted to adjust our spring calf:cow ratios to account for this using
estimated annual antlerless elk harvest and estimates of the ratio of calves to older elk in the harvest from hunter survey data. We consider the subsequent adjusted ratios as indices of spring calf:cow ratios rather than as formal estimates given compounded sampling error from each component (i.e., observed ratio, estimated harvest, estimated age-class distribution in the harvest).

We estimated the exponential population growth rate \((r)\) as the slope of a weighted regression of the natural log transformed population estimates over years for both sightability model and LNME abundance estimates. We used the delta method (Casella and Berger 2002) to obtain the variance-covariance matrix of \(\ln(N)\) from the variance-covariance matrix of \((N)\). For LNME estimates, we obtained the variance-covariance matrix of abundance estimates from Program MARK (White and Burnham 1999). For the sightability model, because we obtained each estimate from independent data, all covariance terms were 0. We used function glm() in R (R Core Development Team 2008) to fit the weighted regression and used the inverse of the variance-covariance matrix of \(\ln(N)\) as the weight-matrix. We constructed confidence intervals for \(r\) using the standard error for the slope from the weighted regression, assuming asymptotic normality.

Survival

We estimated annual survival rates for radiomarked elk during 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 (i.e., 4 survival years) using maximum-likelihood methods by invoking known fate models in Program MARK (White and Burnham 1999). For this analysis we coded encounter history data using 6 groupings: 5 GMU-specific groups for adult cows and a single pooled branch-antlered bull group. We estimated annual survival for a survival year defined as May 1-Apr 30 and estimated confidence intervals for annual survival using profile likelihoods. By using 15 alternative model parameterizations, we tested several hypotheses about Mount St. Helens elk survival during 2009-2012. Models varied in complexity from a simple 2 parameter model (survival differed only by sex, with no temporal or spatial variation) to a 24 parameter model (survival differed across groups and years). We compared models using
Akaike’s Information Criterion, adjusted for small sample sizes ($\text{AIC}_c$) (Burnham and Anderson 2002).

We attempted to account for radiomarked elk mortalities by cause. Outside of the winter-spring season, when we conducted most of our annual population assessment fieldwork, our monitoring of radiomarked elk was infrequent, so sometimes we could not assign a definitive cause of death. We were, however, confident that we could reasonably discriminate most natural mortalities from hunting-related mortalities, based on timing of death, evidence at carcasses we located, or other corroborating evidence (e.g., a cleanly cut collar with no carcass). A majority of the hunting-related mortalities were reported to us by hunters, according to directions embossed on one side of the ear tag each elk received when it was originally captured.

Elk Hoof Disease

During the late 1990s, elk in southwest Washington with an apparent hoof affliction were first reported. Initial reports came from lowland valleys where pastureland interfaced with more traditional elk habitat. These reports, ranging from limping elk to elk with elongated hoof sheaths and/or ulcerated hooves, were sporadically received over the next several years. At the time our study began, the condition was known to exist in segments of the Mount St. Helens elk herd, but appeared to be limited to the west-most portion of the herd area. Our research scope did not formally include evaluating the spatial extent, morbidity, or population dynamics implications of this condition. During our elk capture operations we attempted to avoid capturing elk that were clearly sick or injured, as these animals typically would have elevated risk of capture-related complications. However, during the course of our work we inadvertently captured a few elk with varying degrees of hoof disease; this occurred when the affliction was not obvious as the elk ran from the pursuing helicopter. We did radiocollar such elk, and they provided some limited information on near-term fates of elk with hoof disease. The sample size of radiomarked elk with hoof disease was not sufficient, however, to formally assess any contribution to annual mortality risk for elk, specific to hoof disease, nor would these elk be considered a random sample of affected elk.
Concurrent with the latter portion of our study, investigations were initiated to identify the etiology and better define the epidemiology of this condition. This work is being conducted by veterinary pathologists at several veterinary colleges around the world, in consult with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s staff veterinarian. Results from the veterinary investigations are beyond the scope of this report and will be published elsewhere.

Environmental and Temporal Effects

In addition to the analytic methods previously described, we explored a variety of temporal (year), spatial (GMU or subareas), and weather variables for their effects on responses such as IFBF, pregnancy, recruitment, indexed overwinter mortality, etc. We used general linear models (GLM) when the potential predictor variables were categorical (e.g., year, GMUs, subareas) and/or the response was nominal (e.g., pregnant vs. non-pregnant), and we used ordinary least squares (OLS) regression when responses and potential predictors were interval data. We also estimated the product-moment correlation coefficient to evaluate collinearity between pairs of quantitative variables (e.g., annual recruitment and overwinter mortality indices).

To explore the potential effects of weather on calf recruitment and overwinter mortality, we used SNOTEL data from the Spirit Lake SNOTEL site as potential predictors and the annual calf recruitment index and overwinter mortality index as responses. From the SNOTEL data, we calculated: 1) total late summer/early fall (Aug 1-Sep 30) precipitation, 2) total early summer (May 1–July 31) precipitation, 3) total lactation season (May 1–Sep 30) precipitation, 4) the linear slope (OLS) of accumulated late summer/early fall (Aug 1–Sep 30) precipitation, 5) accumulated snow water equivalents (SWE) for early winter (Dec 1–Jan 31), 6) SWE for late winter (Feb 1–Mar 31), and 7) SWE for the full winter (Nov 1–Mar 31). We used SWE to index winter severity because SNOTEL data on daily snow depth were not routinely collected at any SNOTEL site near our study area until shortly prior to our study, preventing us from characterizing longer-term winter severity. We calculated standard normal deviates (Z) for each weather metric, where \( Z_i = \frac{X_i - \mu}{\sigma} \), and \( X_i \) = the observed value for year \( i \), \( \mu \) = the 1990-2005 mean for that metric, and \( \sigma \) = the standard deviation.
(1990-2005) for that metric. This transformed observed annual weather metrics during our study into the number of standard deviations (+/-) relative to the long-term mean for a given metric. For example, a positive Z value for early summer precipitation would indicate a wetter than normal early summer and a negative Z value would indicate a drier than normal early summer. Spring-summer-fall drought was indicated by negative Z values, and severe winters were indicated by positive Z values. Our hypotheses were that spring calf recruitment would be potentially positively influenced by wet summer-fall weather in the birth year and/or potentially negatively influenced by higher winter severity in the calves’ first winter. We hypothesized overwinter mortality would be higher in springs following droughty summer-falls and/or severe winters. To explore the cumulative effect of poor late summer-fall conditions combined with a subsequent harsh (snowy) winter, we changed the sign of the summer-fall precipitation Z-scores and then summed the summer-fall precipitation and winter SWE Z-scores. We did this so that for both seasonal weather severity indices, a positive Z-score reflected increased weather severity (relative to elk energy budgets) and negative Z-scores for weather severity reflected good environmental conditions for elk.
RESULTS

Capture and Marking

We captured 150 unique elk (110 F: 40 M) during 154 mid-winter capture events, 2009-2012. The ages of cow elk we captured ranged 1-16 years, with most cows in the prime-age class (ages 2-11 years) (Fig. 13). The ages of branch-antlered bull elk we captured ranged 2-9 years (Fig. 14). The median estimated age, based on cementum annuli, for both captured cows and captured bulls was 5 yrs. Yearling cows were very likely under-represented in our captured elk sample (relative to the population) due to size selection intended to prevent darting very large calves (i.e., the sizes of very large calves and very small yearlings potentially overlapped). No elk died during handling; 1 cow elk died within a few days of capture, possibly due to post-capture complications.

We captured 26, 18, 12, 36, and 22 cows and 12, 11, 8, 5, and 4 branch-antlered bulls across GMUs 520, 522, 524, 550, and 556, respectively. Across years, 2009-2012, we captured and radiomarked 44, 27, 21, and 22 cow elk and 11, 11, 10, and 8 branch-antlered bulls, respectively. Effort across years maintained relatively consistent radiomarked elk sample sizes, 2009-2012, in the face of annual attrition due to mortalities and collar malfunction.
Figure 13. Distribution of ages for cow elk captured and radiomarked, Feb 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, Washington.

Figure 14. Distribution of ages for bull elk captured and radiomarked, Feb 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, Washington.
Late-Winter Condition and Fertility

The mean body mass for cow elk handled in February was 218.2 kg (481.1 lbs) (95% CI = 214.9-221.4 kg; 473.9-488.2 lbs). For branch-antlered bulls, mean body mass was 246.3 kg (543.1 lbs) (95% CI = 239.7-253.0 kg; 528.5-557.9 lbs). Cow body mass generally increased with age until about age 5 (Fig. 15). Although body mass among cows we handled was highest at about age 10, age-specific estimates were based on small samples after about age 7. The heaviest cow we handled was 253.7 kg (559.4 lbs) and the heaviest bull was 287.01 kg (632.8 lbs). The numbers of branch-antlered bull elk we handled were insufficient to support inference about the mass vs. age relationship for bulls.

**Figure 15.** Boxplots of age-specific mass for cow elk captured and radiomarked, Feb 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, Washington. Colored boxes represent the middle 50% of estimates within each age-class, and heavy horizontal lines represent median values. Only a single estimated mass was available for cows aged 13, 15, and 16.
Using a general linear model with fixed effects for year, GMU, pregnancy status, and lactation status, we did not detect any systematic effect of year \((P = 0.32)\) on winter body fat (IFBF) for adult \((\geq 2 \text{ yr-old})\) cow elk. GMU, lactation, and pregnancy did affect IFBF \((P = 0.02, 0.07, 0.005, \text{ respectively})\). Lactaters were consistently leaner than non-lactating elk across years (Fig 16). Pregnant elk were fatter than non-pregnant elk (Fig. 17). Pooling years and GMUs, mean IFBF in February was 5.64\% (95\% CI = 5.08-6.21\%) for non-lactating cow elk and was 3.26\% (95\% CI = 2.34-4.18\%) for elk with evidence of late season lactation. Similarly, means for non-pregnant and pregnant adult cows were 3.38\% (95\% CI = 2.56-4.20) and 5.95\% (95\% CI = 5.38-6.52) IFBF.

![Boxplots for ingesta-free body fat (%IFBF) by lactation status for cow elk captured and radiomarked, Feb 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, Washington. Colored boxes represent the middle 50% of estimates, and heavy horizontal lines represent median values.](image)

**Figure 16.** Boxplots for ingesta-free body fat (%IFBF) by lactation status for cow elk captured and radiomarked, Feb 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, Washington. Colored boxes represent the middle 50% of estimates, and heavy horizontal lines represent median values.
Using a general linear model to control for the fixed effects of lactation and pregnancy status, which both were related to IFBF (see above), we found some differences among GMUs in mid-winter IFBF for adult (≥ 2 yr-old) cow elk that we handled, 2009-2012. Using $P \leq 0.05$ as the significance level, GMU 522 cow elk had higher IFBF levels than cow elk captured in GMUs 520 and 550 (Fig. 18); other GMU contrasts were not significantly different ($P > 0.05$).

**Figure 17.** Boxplots for ingesta-free body fat (%IFBF) by pregnancy status for cow elk captured and radiomarked, Feb 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, Washington. Colored boxes represent the middle 50% of estimates, and heavy horizontal lines represent median values.
Figure 18. Plot of marginal means for %IFBF by GMU, controlling for pregnancy and lactation status, Mount St. Helens cow elk, 2009-2012.

Overall, 73 of 109 (67%) adult (≥ 2-yr-old) cow elk we handled in mid-winter, 2009-2012 were pregnant on ultrasound examination; none of 4 yearling cows were pregnant. We had limited data for very old cows, but among 3 cows older than 12 years, 2 (66.7%) were pregnant. Of 73 cows aged 4-10 years, 52 (71.2%) were pregnant in February. Across GMUs, the observed pregnancy rate among adult cows was 42.3% ($n = 26$) in GMU 520, 83.3% ($n = 18$) in GMU 522, 90.0% ($n = 10$) in GMU 524, 71.4% ($n = 35$) in GMU 550, and 65.0% ($n = 20$) in GMU 556. As above, there was a statistical association between cow elk condition and pregnancy; pregnant elk were fatter than non-pregnant elk. We did not detect an effect of year on pregnancy status. Evidence of recent lactation for cows handled in February was rare (4 of 73 pregnant cows; 3.5%).

Fall Body Condition

We collected hunter-contributed organ samples from 423 harvested elk during 2009-2011. These samples ranged from a single contributed organ (e.g., a heart) to all
of the requested organs (*i.e.*, heart, pericardium, kidneys). Among the 423 samples, there were 226 complete organ sets. Overall, we received 360 heart, 285 pericardium, and 347 kidney samples. Cook et al. (2001b) identified Kistner subset scores based on the full organ sample complement as excellent predictors of IFBF; they also explored various 2- and 1-organ subsets for their predictive utility relative to IFBF (R. Cook, personal communication). IFBF was clearly related to all 2 organ component pairs (*e.g.*, heart-pericardium, heart-kidney; $r^2 > 0.90$). Relationships of single organ scores to IFBF were less consistent ($r^2 = 0.64, 0.82$, and $0.88$ for the heart pericardium, and kidneys respectively). We subsequently estimated IFBF using the full organ subsets and all 2-organ subsets available (2-organ predictive equations supplied by R. Cook). This allowed us to derive 364 usable estimates of fall IFBF for hunter-killed cow elk within the Mount St. Helens herd area, 2009-2011. Because yearling cow elk tend to be consistently lean (WDFW, unpublished data), we based further analyses on 323 fall IFBF estimates from cow elk older than 1 yr-old. Generally, the data were approximately normally distributed, with a few more very lean animals than expected (Fig. 19). IFBF estimates ranged 0.30-19.8% for cow elk older than yearlings.

![Frequency histogram (and normal curve) for fall IFBF estimates from hunter-killed cow elk, Mount St. Helens, WA, 2009-2011.](image)
Sample sizes among some GMUs were small, so to explore potential spatial variation among fall IFBF estimates, we grouped the data into subareas (1 = the N. Fork of the Toutle River mudflow; 2 = the managed forest landscape of the core study area [GMUs 520, 524, 550, 556]; 3 = GMU 560; 4 = the Columbia Gorge GMUs). In a general linear model with fixed effects for year, subarea, and lactation status, and with cow age as a covariate, there were significant ($P \leq 0.05$) effects of subarea and lactation on IFBF; year and cow age did not affect IFBF. The marginal means by lactation status, controlling for other factors, were 12.51% IFBF for non-lactaters and 10.84% for lactaters. In the subarea contrasts, IFBF for cows from subarea 2 was lower (marginal mean = 9.20%) than for subarea 3 (marginal mean = 13.07%) and for subarea 4 (marginal mean = 12.38%) cows (Fig. 20). Estimates for mudflow cows (marginal mean = 12.07%) were qualitatively similar to estimates for subarea 3 and 4 cows and different than for subarea 2 cows, but because few mudflow cows were sampled ($n = 9$) the pair-wise contrasts involving mudflow cows were nonsignificant.

**Figure 20.** Boxplots for fall %IFBF from hunter-killed elk across subareas (1 = GMU 522, 2 = GMUs 520, 524, 550, 556, 3 = GMU 560, 4 = Columbia Gorge GMUs) by lactation status, Mount St. Helens, WA, 2009-2011.
Sightability Modeling

We collected sighting trial data for 331 groups containing at least 1 radiomarked elk during 2009-2011. Overall, we saw 174 groups (52.6%) without aid of telemetry and missed 157 groups (47.4%) that we later located via telemetry. We saw a higher proportion of radiomarked cow groups (146 of 261 groups; 55.9%) than of radiomarked bull groups (28 of 70 groups; 40.0%; Table 1). Elk were more easily seen when in larger groups, when active, and when in open (i.e., low canopy cover) cover types (Table 1). Relative snow cover and light conditions, as we measured them, did not seem to systematically affect elk sightability on this landscape.

The covariates CAN, GRP, LG2GRP, and SEX were all related to the probability that an elk group was sighted in univariate tests (Table 2). Because one of the outcomes (i.e., sighted or missed) was not observed for at least 1 level of the categorical covariates ACT and COV, MLEs did not exist for these covariates. We recoded ACT into a new covariate (ACT2) with 2 levels: 0 = bedded; 1 = active, and we recoded COV into a new covariate (COV2) with 4 levels: 1 = clearcut; 2 = regeneration stand, conifer, or alder; 3 = meadow, wetland, field, or mudflow. These new covariates were related to the probability that an elk group was sighted (Table 2).

Preliminary modeling indicated that LG2GRP was a better predictor of sightability than was the untransformed GRP covariate, so we subsequently used LG2GRP in all multivariate models. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) suggested that the covariate CAN (% canopy) was collinear with the recoded cover type covariate (COV2) ($r^2 = 0.51$), so we chose to use only the CAN covariate in subsequent multivariate logistic models. In a large number of cases where we missed a group and subsequently located it via telemetry we could not confidently determine the group’s initial activity level, which resulted in a large number of missing values for ACT2. We were not comfortable attempting to impute data for all of these missing values, and to preclude eliminating a large number of cases from our multivariable models because of the missing activity data, we elected to drop the activity covariate from further consideration.
Table 1. Summary of univariate association of independent variable levels and sightability of elk groups during helicopter surveys, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Total Groups</th>
<th>Groups Seen</th>
<th>%Seen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canopy (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-55</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-75</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;75</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 50</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cow-calf</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bull</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bedded</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standing</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moving</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear cut</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regeneration</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conifer</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alder</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field/meadow/wetland</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>river or road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bright</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flat</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Results of univariate significance tests (logistic regression) for predictor variables potentially affecting sightability of elk groups during spring helicopter surveys, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2011. Bold text delineates predictors significantly related to group sightability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$P$-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>296.44</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRP</td>
<td>62.28</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2GRP</td>
<td>40.69</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT2</td>
<td>79.16</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COV</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COV2</td>
<td>131.67</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIGHT</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** model did not converge; MLE does not exist.

Among our candidate sightability models, 2 models accounted for 98% of the available model weight (Table 3). The best model had 3 predictor variables (LG2GRP, CAN, and SEX) and an intercept. The next best model, which was 1.70 AICc units from the best model, was similar except that it lacked the SEX variable. All of the remaining models were at least 7.36 AICc units from the best-supported model. Simple (i.e., 1 predictor variable) models that predicted sightability based on group size (LG2GRP), canopy closure (CAN), or sex (SEX) alone had little support. The sign for the SEX
covariate differed between the single variable model (i.e., SEX was the only predictor) and the best multivariable model, the $\beta_i$ for SEX was erratic across models and was poorly estimated (i.e., large SE) (Table 4), the sign for SEX in the best multivariable model was illogical, and the Wald statistic for SEX in the best multivariable model was marginally nonsignificant ($P = 0.06$). Collectively, these results made us skeptical of inclusion of SEX in the multivariable context. So, we subsequently selected the second best model in Table 3 as our best model. This model predicted larger elk groups were more likely to be seen, as were elk in more open habitat (Table 4). This model fit the data (Hosmer-Lemeshow statistic = 9.26; $P = 0.32$) and correctly classified 91.4% of the model building observations; 163 of 179 groups predicted to be seen were seen (91.0% correct), and 125 or 136 groups predicted to be missed were missed (91.9% correct).

**Table 3.** Model selection results for models predicting the sightability of elk groups from a helicopter, Mount St. Helens Elk Herd Area, 2009-2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$K^a$</th>
<th>$-2LL$</th>
<th>$AIC_c$</th>
<th>$\Delta AIC_c^b$</th>
<th>$w_i^c$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LG2GRP, CAN, SEX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>145.59</td>
<td>153.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2GRP, CAN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>149.34</td>
<td>155.42</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>157.04</td>
<td>161.08</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN, SEX</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>157.01</td>
<td>163.09</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2GRP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>397.32</td>
<td>401.35</td>
<td>247.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2GRP, SEX</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>396.41</td>
<td>402.49</td>
<td>248.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>452.35</td>
<td>456.39</td>
<td>302.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Number of unique parameters in model $i$.
$^b$Difference in $AIC_c$ units between model $i$ and the best model.
$^c$Relative model weight in model $i$. 
Table 4. Parameter estimates ($\beta_i$ and standard errors = SE) for the fitted sightability models from Table 3, Mount St. Helens Elk Herd, 2009-2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>LG2GRP</th>
<th>SE(LG2GRP)</th>
<th>CAN</th>
<th>SE(CAN)</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>SE(SEX)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LG2GRP, CAN, SEX</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2GRP, CAN</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN, SEX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2GRP</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2GRP, SEX</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fitting the 2-predictor multivariable model with effects of group size and canopy on predicted sightabilities yielded the following model:

$$y = 2.85 + 0.42(LG2GRP) - 0.09(CAN)$$

Sightability-corrected estimates of total elk abundance and total cow elk abundance (2 estimates per year from replicated surveys), derived from the above sightability model, indicated relatively stable to slightly increasing numbers of elk within our 5-GMU study area from 2009 to 2011 and a subsequent substantial decline during 2012-2013 (Fig. 21). Peak point estimates for total elk and total cow elk were 5,132 elk and 2,803 cow elk in the spring of 2011; minimum point estimates were 2,717 elk and 1,608 cow elk in the spring of 2013.

GMU-specific estimates for total elk abundance, 2009-2013 (Figs. 22-26), indicated a relatively steady decline in elk abundance in GMUs 520 and 550, a modest decline in GMU 524, an initial increase followed by a substantial decline in GMU 556, and initially increasing then stabilizing numbers of elk in GMU 522.
Figure 21. Sightability model estimates (± 95% CI) for total elk and total cow elk abundance in the study area, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.
Figure 22. Sightability model estimates for total elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 520, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.

Figure 23. Sightability model estimates for total elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 522, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.
Figure 24. Sightability model estimates for total elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 524, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.

Figure 25. Sightability model estimates for total elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 550, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.
Figure 26. Sightability model estimates for total elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 556, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.

GMU-specific estimates for total cow elk abundance, 2006-2013 (Figs. 27-31), also indicated a steady decline in the number of cow elk in GMUs 520 and 550, a modest decline in GMU 524, a slight increase followed by a decrease in GMU 556, and a relatively steady increase in cow numbers in GMU 522.
Figure 27. Sightability model estimates for cow elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 520, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.

Figure 28. Sightability model estimates for cow elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 522, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.
Figure 29. Sightability model estimates for cow elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 524, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.

Figure 30. Sightability model estimates for cow elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 550, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.
Estimated cow elk abundance
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Figure 31. Sightability model estimates for cow elk abundance (± 95% CI) in GMU 556, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.

Mark-Resight

As per the Methods section (above), we generated mark-resight estimates 2009-2012 using the LNME model, a multi-sampling-occasion model, and using the Lincoln-Petersen (LP) model for 2013 (1 sampling occasion). Across the 11 LNME models for total elk in the area surveyed twice each year, 2009-2012, the best supported model had a constant detection parameter ($p_i$), 2 unique heterogeneity parameters ($\sigma_i$) (where 2009=2011 and 2010=2012), and annual variation in estimated total elk (Table 5). Two other models were within 2 AIC$_c$ units of the best model. The second best-supported model had 2 unique detection parameters (1 for 2012 and 1 for all other years), a constant heterogeneity parameter, and annual variation in estimated total elk (Table 5). The last model within 2 AIC$_c$ units of the best model was the simplest model, with a single estimated detection parameter across all sessions, a constant heterogeneity
estimate, and annual variation in estimated total elk (Table 5). The remaining models had limited support.

Table 5. Model selection results for LNME mark-resight estimates of total number of elk in the 5-GMU study area, 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, WA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modela</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>AICc</th>
<th>ΔAICc</th>
<th>wi</th>
<th>Devf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$p(.) , \sigma^2(2009=2011\neq 2010=2012), N(\text{yr})$</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>829.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>814.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p(2012\neq \text{else}), \sigma^2(.) , N(\text{yr})$</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>830.35</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>815.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p(.) , \sigma^2(.) , N(\text{yr})$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>830.72</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>818.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p(2011\neq \text{else}), \sigma^2(.) , N(\text{yr})$</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>832.12</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>817.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p(2009\neq \text{else}), \sigma^2(.) , N(\text{yr})$</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>832.50</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>818.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p(\text{sess1}\neq \text{sess2}), \sigma^2(.) , N(\text{yr})$</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>832.52</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>818.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p(.) , \sigma^2(\text{yr}), N(\text{yr})$</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>833.35</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>814.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p(2010\neq \text{else}), \sigma^2(.) , N(\text{yr})$</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>833.71</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>819.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p(\text{yr}), \sigma^2(.) , N(\text{yr})$</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>834.46</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>815.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p(\text{sess1}\neq \text{sess2g}), \sigma^2(\text{yr}), N(\text{yr})$</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>835.19</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>814.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p(\text{full}), \sigma^2(\text{yr}), N(\text{yr})$</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>842.89</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>808.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a model structure ($p =$ detection probability; $\sigma^2 =$ heterogeneity parameter; $N =$ abundance estimate).
b number of unique model parameters.
c Akaike's Information Criterion, adjusted for small samples.
d difference in AICc units between model and the best model.
e Akaike model weight.
f model deviance.
g detection probability varied between first and second surveys, but no annual effect.

Model-averaged estimates of total elk abundance in the area we surveyed each year with replicated surveys, based on the LNME model weights in Table 5, suggested a modest decline in total elk during 2009-2012; using the LP estimate from the same area in 2013 suggested an overall substantial decline in total elk, 2009-2013 (Fig. 32).
Actual estimates ranged from a high of 8,238 elk in 2011 to a low of 4,987 in 2013. Estimates generally depicted a consistent pattern, except that the 2011 estimate was substantially higher than the estimates for the previous 2 years. We discuss possible explanations for this in the Discussion section, but note here that the 2009-2010 winter was by far the mildest winter of the study; the high estimate for the spring of 2011 occurred 1 year after the mild winter. The models in Table 5 and the estimates derived from those models in Fig. 32 also did not allow detection rates of cows and bulls to be sex-specific.

![Estimated total elk](image)

**Figure 32.** Mark-resight estimates (2009-2012 = LNME; 2013 = Lincoln-Petersen) for total elk (± 95% CI) in the 5-GMU study area, 2009-2013, Mount St. Helens, WA.

Among the 10 LNME models we evaluated for estimating the total number of cow elk and the total number of branch-antlered bull elk in the area we surveyed twice each year, 2009-2012, only 2 models were well-supported. Collectively, these 2 models
accounted for 99% of the available model weight. The best model had 12 unique parameters: 2 year-invariant, but sex-specific detection parameters, 2 year-invariant, but sex-specific heterogeneity parameters, and sex and year-specific estimates of abundance (Table 6). The next best model was 0.81 AICc units from the best model and differed from the best model only in that it had a single unique detection parameter that was equal for both sexes (Table 6). The remaining models in the candidate model set, including those with the least and most unique parameters were not supported.

Table 6. Model selection results for LNME mark-resight estimates of total number of cow elk and branch-antlered bull elk in the 5-GMU study area, 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, WA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modela</th>
<th>k^b</th>
<th>AICc^c</th>
<th>∆AICc^d</th>
<th>wi^e</th>
<th>Dev^f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p(sex),σ^2^2(sex),N(sex × yr)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>869.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>844.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(.),σ^2^2(sex),N(sex × yr)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>870.11</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>847.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(sex × yr),σ^2^2(sex),N(sex × yr)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>877.22</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>838.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(yr),σ^2^2(sex × yr),N(sex × yr)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>885.94</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>833.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(sex × yr),σ^2^2(sex × yr),N(sex × yr)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>901.08</td>
<td>31.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>828.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(sex),σ^2^2(sex),N(F_1=2≠3≠4, M[.])</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>980.79</td>
<td>111.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>964.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(.),σ^2^2(sex),N(F_1=2≠3, M[.])</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1000.94</td>
<td>131.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>986.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(sex),σ^2^2(sex),N(sex)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1022.40</td>
<td>153.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1010.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(sex),σ^2^2(sex),N(F_1=2≠3≠4, M[.])</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1023.15</td>
<td>153.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1008.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(.),σ^2^2(.),N(sex × yr)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3596.29</td>
<td>2726.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3575.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>model structure (p = detection probability; σ^2 = heterogeneity parameter; N = abundance estimate).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>number of unique model parameters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Akaike’s Information Criterion, adjusted for small samples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>difference in AICc units between model i and the best model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Akaike model weight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>model deviance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>cow elk abundance constrained [number subscripts 1-4 = spring 2009-2012].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model-averaged estimates of total cow elk abundance in the area we surveyed each year with replicated surveys, based on the LNME model weights in Table 6, suggested a pattern similar to the pattern for the total elk abundance estimates, 2009-2012 (Fig. 33). The LNME estimates for total cows declined from spring 2009 to spring 2010, increased again in spring 2011, and declined in spring 2012. Estimates ranged from a high of 4,444 cows in 2011 to a low of 3,758 cows in 2010. Including the LP estimate from the 2013 mark-resight survey, the overall pattern indicated a decline in the number of cow elk, 2009-2013 (Fig. 33). The LNME estimates for total branch-antlered bull abundance, 2009-2012, and the 2013 LP estimate for branch-antlered bull abundance in the area we surveyed each year suggested a relatively stable branch-antlered bull subpopulation, 2009-2013 (Fig. 34). Estimated bull numbers ranged from 647 (2009) to 797 (2013); confidence intervals for the 2013 cow and bull estimates were broad.

![Figure 33](image_url). Mark-resight estimates (2009-2012 = LNME; 2013 = Lincoln-Petersen) for total cow elk (± 95% CI) in the 5-GMU study area, 2009-2013, Mount St. Helens, WA.
Detection rates for radiomarked elk, estimated as the derived parameter $\mu$ under the fully parameterized, sex-specific, LNME model (Table 6) were generally higher for radiomarked cows than for bulls (Table 7). Estimated detection for cows ranged 0.43-0.64 across surveys; 6 of 8 estimated detection rates for radiomarked cow elk were >0.50. Estimated detection for bulls ranged 0.28-0.56 across surveys; only 3 of 8 detection rate estimates for radiomarked bulls exceeded 0.50. Under the best sex-specific model, which had a single detection rate parameter for cows and a single parameter for bulls, $\mu = 0.54$ (95% CI = 0.49-0.59) for radiomarked cows and $\mu = 0.44$ (95% CI = 0.36-0.54) for radiomarked bulls.

**Figure 34.** Mark-resight estimates (2009-2012 = LNME; 2013 = Lincoln-Petersen) for total branch-antlered bull elk ($\pm$ 95% CI) in the 5-GMU study area, 2009-2013, Mount St. Helens, WA.
Table 7. Estimated detection rates for radiomarked elk from the fully parameterized, sex-specific LNME mark-resight model, 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, WA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Estimated detection ($\mu$)</th>
<th>95% CI$_{low}$</th>
<th>95% CI$_{high}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the 15 models in the candidate model set for data coded to 7 groups (GMU-specific cows, branch-antlered bulls in GMU 522, branch-antlered bulls in the other 4 GMUs), 2 models garnered >80% of the model weight (Table 8). The best model had 4 detection parameters (i.e., cows in GMU 522, all other cows, bulls in GMU 522, and bulls in all other GMUs), a single heterogeneity parameter that applied to all groups across all years, and group and sex-specific abundance parameters. The second best model was similar, except that heterogeneity was modeled as sex-specific (Table 8). All the remaining models were at least 3.52 AICc units from the best-supported model.
Table 8. Model selection results for LNME mark-resight estimates of group-specific cow elk (5 groups = GMU) and branch-antlered bull elk (2 groups = mudflow and non-mudflow bulls), 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, WA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>K&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>$\text{AIC}_c$&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>$\Delta\text{AIC}_c$&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>$w_i$&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Dev&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$pF(522^2)$, $pM$(grp), $\sigma^2$(.), $N$(grp $\times$ yr)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1041.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>967.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pF(522)$, $pM$(grp), $\sigma^2$(sex),$N$(grp $\times$ yr)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1043.10</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>966.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pF(\cdot)$, $pM$(grp), $\sigma^2$(.), $N$(grp $\times$ yr)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1044.80</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>973.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pF(\cdot)$, $pM$(grp), $\sigma^2$(sex),$N$(grp $\times$ yr)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1046.45</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>972.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pF$(grp), $pM$(grp), $\sigma^2$(sex),$N$(grp $\times$ yr)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1047.24</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>962.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pF(522)$, $pM$(grp), $\sigma^2$(.), $N$(grp $\times$ yr, $M''$)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1048.31</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>981.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pF(\cdot)$, $pM$(grp), $\sigma^2$(.), $N$(grp $\times$ yr, $M'$)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1051.76</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>987.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pF(522)$, $pM$(grp), $\sigma^2$(sex),$N$(grp $\times$ yr)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1055.57</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>981.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pF(\cdot)$, $pM$(grp), $\sigma^2$(sex),$N$(grp $\times$ yr)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1058.94</td>
<td>17.67</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>987.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pF(522)$, $pM$(grp), $\sigma^2$(sex),$N$(grp $\times$ yr, $F''$)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1127.33</td>
<td>86.06</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1058.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pF(\cdot)$, $pM$(grp), $\sigma^2$(sex),$N$(grp $\times$ yr, $F'$)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1135.67</td>
<td>94.39</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1069.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pF(522)$, $pM$(grp), $\sigma^2$(sex),$N$(grp $\times$ yr, $F''$)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1262.98</td>
<td>221.70</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1203.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pF(\cdot)$, $pM$(grp), $\sigma^2$(sex),$N$(grp $\times$ yr, $F''$)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1278.86</td>
<td>237.58</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1221.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pF(522)$, $pM$(grp), $\sigma^2$(.), $N$(grp)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1898.10</td>
<td>856.82</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1873.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pF(\cdot)$, $pM$(grp), $\sigma^2$(.), $N$(grp)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1904.74</td>
<td>863.47</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1881.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> model structure ($pF$ = cow detection probability; $pM$ = bull detection probability; $\sigma^2$ = heterogeneity parameter; $N$ = abundance estimate).

<sup>b</sup> number of unique model parameters.

<sup>c</sup> Akaike’s Information Criterion, adjusted for small samples.

<sup>d</sup> difference in $\text{AIC}_c$ units between model, and the best model.

<sup>e</sup> Akaike model weight.

<sup>f</sup> model deviance.

<sup>g</sup> unique cow detection parameter for GMU 522 cows.

<sup>h</sup> abundance for non-GMU 522 bulls constant across years.

<sup>i</sup> abundance for GMU 556 cows constant across years.

<sup>j</sup> abundance for GMU 556 and GMU 524 cows constant across years.
Model-averaged LNME estimates of cow elk abundance in the area we surveyed each year with replicated surveys, based on the model weights in Table 8, suggested a substantial decline in GMU 520 and 550 during 2009-2012 (Figure 35). In GMU 520, point estimates indicated a decline of more than 40% between spring 2009 and spring 2012. In GMU 550, the indicated decline over the same period was about 1/3. During 2009-2012, cow elk abundance estimates in GMU 522 (the mudflow) increased, then stabilized (Fig. 35). In GMU 524, cow elk abundance estimates declined substantially between spring 2009 and spring 2010, and then became relatively stable (Fig. 35). Model-averaged LNME estimates for GMU 556 followed the same qualitative pattern as we had seen for total elk and total cow elk (Figs. 32, 33); estimates declined from 2009 to 2010, increased in 2011, and declined again in 2012 (Fig. 36). Overall, in GMU 556, estimated cow elk abundance was slightly higher in the last spring we conducted replicated surveys (2012) than it had been in the first 2 springs of our work (2009, 2010). We did not attempt to generate Lincoln-Petersen estimates of abundance at the GMU scale for the single 2013 survey because the numbers of marked elk per GMU were too small by spring 2013 to justify this approach.

Under the best LNME model derived for the 7-group dataset, the derived detection rate estimates (μ) for radiomarked elk were higher for both cow elk and for branch-antlered bull elk in GMU 522 (and the other portions of the North Fork of the Toutle R. mudflow) than for the rest of the study area (Table 9). Estimated detectability for bulls in the managed forest was relatively low and less than half that of mudflow bulls. LNME estimates for bull abundance were relatively stable 2009-2012 for both mudflow bulls and the forested subarea bulls (Fig. 37).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Estimated detection (μ)</th>
<th>95% CI low</th>
<th>95% CI high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cows (GMU≠522)</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cows (GMU=522)</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA bulls (GMU≠522)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA bulls (GMU=522)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Estimated detection rates for radiomarked elk from the best-supported, group-specific LNME mark-resight model, 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, WA.
Figure 35. LNME Mark-resight estimates, 2009-2012, for total cow elk (± 95% CI) in GMUs 520 and 550 (top panel); 522 and 524 (bottom panel), Mount St. Helens, WA.
Figure 36. LNME Mark-resight estimates, 2009-2012, for total cow elk (± 95% CI) in GMU 556, Mount St. Helens, WA.

Figure 37. LNME Mark-resight estimates, 2009-2012, for total branch-antlered bull elk (± 95% CI), Mount St. Helens, WA.
Rate of Increase and Method Contrast

The series of annual estimates indicated a slight decline (negative rate of increase) for total elk abundance and total cow elk abundance using sightability model estimates, 2009-2013 (Table 10). By GMU, cow elk numbers declined substantially ($\approx -20\%$) in GMUs 520, 524, and 550 using sightability model estimates. Cow elk abundance increased in GMU 522 and appeared relatively stable in GMU 556 using the sightability model estimates. For the mark-resight estimates, 2009-2012, total elk abundance trend was relatively flat and slightly negative for all cow elk (Table 10). For GMU 520, 524, and 550 cow elk, the mark-resight estimates indicated a substantive decline ($\approx 15\%$); the trend for GMU 522 mark-resight cow estimates was substantially positive and for GMU 556 cows was modestly positive (Table 10).

Table 10. Estimated group-specific, exponential rate of increase ($r$), Mount St. Helens, WA. Sightability model estimates (2009-2013); LNME mark-resight estimates (2009-2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abundance</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>95% CI&lt;sub&gt;low&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>95% CI&lt;sub&gt;high&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sightability model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All elk</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cow elk</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMU 520 cows</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMU 522 cows</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMU 524 cows</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMU 550 cows</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMU 556 cows</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LNME mark-resight</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All elk</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cow elk</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cow elk (2009-2013)</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMU 520 cows</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMU 522 cows</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMU 524 cows</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMU 550 cows</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMU 556 cows</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mark-resight estimates for GMU-specific cow abundance across years, 2009-2012, were highly correlated (Pearson’s $r \geq 0.94$; $P < 0.001$) with sightability model estimates (from first and second session replicates, and means of the 2) (Fig. 38).
Figure 38. Correlation between Sightability Model (SM) estimates and LNME mark-resight estimates for cow elk abundance, 2009-2012 (panels are, top to bottom: for first survey replicate SM estimate, second survey SM estimate, and the means of the 2 annual SM estimates).
Recruitment

Annual observed spring calf recruitment across the entire 5-GMU study area varied considerably during 2009-2013, with estimates exceeding 40 calves per 100 cows in 2010 and 2011 and an estimate < 25 calves per 100 cows in 2013 (Fig. 39).

![Graph showing calf recruitment estimates from 2009 to 2013.](image)

**Figure 39.** Elk calf-cow spring ratio estimates (plus 95% CI), 2009-2013, for the 5-GMU survey area, from aerial surveys, Mount St. Helens, WA.

In most of the 5 GMUs, the observed pattern was qualitatively similar to the landscape-level pattern. In 2011, the highest calf ratio estimates across the time series occurred in GMUs 520, 522, 524, and 550 (Fig. 40). The highest estimate in GMU 556 occurred in 2010. In all GMUs except 520, the observed ratios were relatively high in 2010 and 2011 and relatively low in 2009, 2012, and 2013 (Fig. 40). After adjusting the observed GMU-specific spring calf ratios for antlerless elk harvest the previous fall, the derived calf recruitment indices followed a relatively consistent pattern across all 5 GMUs (Fig. 41). Adjusting for antlerless harvest mostly had the effect of aligning the GMU 520 pattern to those of the other 4 GMUs, and aligning the indices for 2012 and 2013 across GMUs.
Figure 40. GMU-specific elk calf-cow spring ratio estimates (plus 95% CI), 2009-2013, from aerial surveys, Mount St. Helens, WA.
Survival

Over the course of the study, the sample sizes of elk at risk were relatively similar during the last 3 survival years; the sample of radiomarked elk was smaller in the first survival year in our analysis. We documented the deaths of 79 radiomarked elk (Fig. 42). Deaths per year ranged from 14 (2009-2010) to 31 (2012-2013). The numbers of elk killed by hunters were relatively stable (n = 9-13) across years, but the number of elk dying of natural causes was much higher in the last year of the study than in the first 3 years (Fig. 42). The results suggested that the final survival year (2012-2013) was typified by a particularly high loss of radiomarked elk, relative to other years. The
natural mortalities during 2012-2013 were spread across all 5 GMUs (i.e., were not limited to mudflow elk).

![bar chart](image)

**Figure 42.** Total radiomarked elk deaths by cause, Mount St. Helens, Washington, survival years 2009-2012. Sample size of collared elk at risk at the beginning of each survival year is shown at the top of the panel.

Among the candidate models in our survival model set, 2 models accounted for 68% of the available model weight; the best model accounted for 50% of the weight and the next best model garnered 18% of the model weight (Table 11). The best model had a common cow survival parameter for GMUs 520, 522, 524, and 556 that was constant during 2009-2011, a common cow survival parameter for all GMUs during the last survival year (2012), a unique survival parameter for GMU 550 cows during 2009-2011, and constant bull survival across years. The second-best model differed only in that it
had a unique 2012 survival parameter for GMU 550 cows. All of the remaining models were at least 2.88 AICc units from the best supported model and were not competitive with the best-supported model.

Table 11. Model selection results for radiomarked elk survival, Mount St. Helens, 2009-2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>ΔAICc</th>
<th>wi</th>
<th>Deviance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad F (year,GMU model1, Ad M ...)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>26.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad F (year,GMU model2, Ad M ...)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>26.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad F (year,GMU model3, Ad M ...)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>23.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad F (year,GMU model2), Ad M (2012#else)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>26.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad F (year,GMU model3), Ad M (2012#else)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>23.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad F (2012#else), Ad M (.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>33.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad F (year,GMU model4, Ad M ...)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>30.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad F (2012#else), Ad M (2012#else)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>33.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad F (year,GMU model5, Ad M ...)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>33.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad F (year,GMU model6, Ad M ...)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>32.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad F (year), Ad M (year)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>32.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad F (year,GMU model7, Ad M ...)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>39.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad F (.), Ad M (.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>48.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad F (GMU), Ad M (.)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>43.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad F (year,GMU), Ad M (year)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.32</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>08.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aNumber of unique parameters in model.

bAICc difference between best model and modeli.

cAkaike model weight.


hGMU550 2012#GMUelse 2012#GMUall 2009-2011.


Model-averaged annual survival estimates were modest (0.84-0.86) for adult cows in GMUs 520, 522, 524, and 556 for the 3 survival years beginning in 2009-2011 (Table 12). Estimated cow survival was substantially lower (0.52) across those GMUs in the survival year beginning in 2012, and was relatively low (0.51-0.66) in all 4 years for GMU 550 cows (Table 12). Estimated annual survival for branch-antlered bulls was 0.55-0.56 across years. Most survival estimates were relatively precise, but estimated cow survival for the last survival year and estimates across years for GMU 550 cows had relatively wide confidence intervals. Under the best supported model from Table 11, annual cow survival was estimated to be 0.85 (95% CI = 0.78-0.91) during 2009-2011 in GMUs 520, 522, 524, and 556. During the same years, cow survival was estimated at 0.64 (95% CI = 0.48-0.78) in GMU 550. Under the best model, cow survival in the final survival year (2012-2013) was estimated to be 0.52 (95% CI = 0.38-0.65) across all 5 GMUs. Branch-antlered bull survival under the best model was estimated to be 0.56 (95% CI = 0.43-0.67) across years.
Table 12. Model-averaged annual survival estimates (S-hat) and associated unconditional 95% confidence intervals for radiomarked Mount St. Helens elk for 4 survival years using the models and Akaike model weights from Table 11. All estimates are for radiomarked adult cow elk, unless specified otherwise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GMU</th>
<th>S-hat</th>
<th>95% CI for S-hat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.73-0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.75-0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.75-0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.38-0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.73-0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.75-0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.75-0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.38-0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.73-0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.75-0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.75-0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.38-0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.41-0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.47-0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.47-0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.28-0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.73-0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.75-0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.75-0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.38-0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>BA bulls&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.43-0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>BA bulls</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.43-0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>BA bulls</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.43-0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>BA bulls</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.41-0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Branch-antlered bulls.
Hoof Disease Observations

Although elk hoof disease remains an extremely important management issue in southwest Washington, our study’s scope did not include evaluating the condition’s etiology, prevalence, or distribution. As described in the Methods section, the elk marking and monitoring design also was not intended to quantify the condition’s specific effects on elk population dynamics nor its long-term implications for elk management. Limited information, however, was obtained regarding the short-term fates of elk that had various presentations of hoof pathology when we captured them for radiomarking (inadvertently). During 2009-2012, we handled 16 elk with some hoof irregularity (Table 13). The hoof issues we observed ranged from minor overgrowth of the keratinized portion of the hoof (often colloquially called “elf slipper” or “scissor hooves”) to substantial ulceration (typically between the toes). Most of the elk we handled with hoof issues did not die in the very near-term, typically surviving for at least a year or more; several survived for the duration of the study or the duration of the time we were able to monitor their fates (i.e., until collar drop for GPS-instrumented elk) (Table 13).

Because of increasing concerns about the prevalence of hoof disease during the latter portion of our study and because we detected a substantial number of previously unreported mortalities of radiomarked elk just prior to our last surveys associated with this study (spring 2013), we attempted to locate the carcasses of all radiomarked elk transmitting mortality signals as of April 2013, following our survey flights. Of the 19 elk transmitting mortality signals, 1 was located at a residence (i.e., unreported harvest) and 6 had been dead too long to reliably determine cause of death (e.g., could not rule out wounding loss from fall 2012 hunting seasons). Of the remaining 12, a minimum of 9 showed physical evidence of malnutrition, and malnutrition was suspected as the cause of death for the other 3 based on time-of-death and location; 3 of the 9 elk known to have succumbed to malnutrition had moderate-to-severe hoof disease (2 had 2 foot involvement, 1 had a single affected hoof), and 2 had a minor hoof deformity on 1 foot. Thus, among the mortalities of radiomarked elk we investigated in April 2013, most appeared to be linked to malnutrition. A small number of these instances may have
involved hoof disease as a contributing factor, but most apparently were unrelated to any hoof affliction.

Table 13. Fates of elk with any visible hoof issue at capture among those elk radiomarked 2009-2012, Mount St. Helens, WA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marked</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Fate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2009</td>
<td>Moderate hoof disease</td>
<td>Hunter-kill fall 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2009</td>
<td>Moderate hoof disease</td>
<td>Survived winter ‘09-’10; dead by spring 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2009</td>
<td>Scissor hooves</td>
<td>Survived until winter ’12-’13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2009</td>
<td>Scissor hooves</td>
<td>Contact lost winter ’11-’12; alive until then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2009</td>
<td>Scissor hooves</td>
<td>Still alive as of spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2009</td>
<td>Scissor hooves</td>
<td>Hunter-kill fall 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2009</td>
<td>Scissor hoof</td>
<td>Hunter-kill fall 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2009</td>
<td>Clubbed hoof</td>
<td>Hunter-kill fall 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2009</td>
<td>Scissor hoof</td>
<td>Hunter-kill fall 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2011</td>
<td>Moderate hoof disease</td>
<td>Alive at GPS collar drop May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2011</td>
<td>Moderate hoof disease</td>
<td>Alive at GPS collar drop May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2011</td>
<td>Moderate hoof disease</td>
<td>Alive at GPS collar drop May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2012</td>
<td>Severe hoof disease</td>
<td>Still alive as of spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2012</td>
<td>Moderate hoof disease</td>
<td>Still alive as of spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2012</td>
<td>Moderate hoof disease</td>
<td>Still alive as of spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2012</td>
<td>Severe hoof disease</td>
<td>Survived winter ’11-’12; missing by spring 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Effects

Among potential response variables, we found significant correlations between observed calf ratio and the harvest-corrected calf ratio index \( r = 0.99, P = 0.001 \), between the overwinter mortality index and both the observed calf ratio \( r = -0.81, P = 0.10 \) and the calf ratio index \( r = -0.82, P = 0.09 \), and between fall IFBF estimated from harvested cow elk organ sets and both the observed calf ratio \( r = 1.0, P = 0.001 \) and the calf ratio index \( r = 1.0, P = 0.03 \). We did not find significant correlations between
the overwinter mortality index and either fall IFBF from the organ sets \((r = -0.60, P = 0.59)\) or mid-winter IFBF estimated for live-captured elk \((r = 0.62, P = 0.38)\); mid-winter IFBF for live elk was also not correlated with observed calf ratios \((r = -0.03, P = 0.97)\), the corrected calf ratio index \((r = 0.03, P = 0.98)\), or the fall IFBF estimates from harvested elk organs \((r = 0.25, P = 0.84)\). Among these response variables, the organ-based fall estimates of IFBF represented only 3 data years, so the correlations involving those data derived from only 3 bivariate data points.

Live elk IFBF estimates were not significantly correlated with any of the spring-summer-fall precipitation metrics \((r = -0.35-0.68, P = 0.33-0.96)\). Live elk IFBF, was also not correlated with early winter SWEs \((r = 0.80, P = 0.20)\) and the sign of this nonsignificant correlation coefficient for the relationship was nonsensical (i.e., as early winter snowfall increased, mid-winter body fat estimates increased). Based on only 3 data points (i.e., years), fall IFBF derived from harvested elk organ sets was correlated with the slope of a fitted regression line to late summer-fall precipitation \((r = 1.0, P = 0.07, \text{and the sign of the relationship was sensible}), \) but was not significantly correlated with early summer precipitation \((r = 0.62, P = 0.58)\), total late summer-fall precipitation \((r = 0.90, P = 0.29)\), or total spring-summer-fall precipitation \((r = 0.85, P = 0.35)\).

The observed calf ratios and the calf recruitment indices were strongly related to late summer-fall precipitation; annual calf recruitment was higher in springs with greater precipitation (and the rate of daily precipitation accumulation) occurring during the previous late summer and early fall (Fig. 43). More than 90% of the variation in the annual calf recruitment indices was explained by the late summer-fall precipitation metrics. The spring calf recruitment metrics were not correlated with early summer precipitation \((r = 0.21-0.25, P = 0.69-0.74)\) or with total spring-summer-fall precipitation \((r = 0.65-0.69, P = 0.20-0.23)\). Likewise, calf recruitment was weakly correlated with SWEs for the early winter \((r = -0.33 \text{ to } -0.37, P = 0.54-0.59)\), late winter \((r = -0.37 \text{ to } -0.43, P = 0.47-0.54)\), and full winter periods \((r = -0.33 \text{ to } -0.38, P = 0.52-0.59)\).

The overwinter mortality index was poorly correlated with the previous early summer \((r = -0.49, P = 0.33)\), late-summer fall \((r = -0.30, P = 0.57)\) and total spring-summer-fall precipitation \((r = -0.53, P = 0.28)\). Overwinter mortality was, however,
correlated with late winter and full winter SWEs ($r = 0.87, 0.81; P = 0.02, 0.05$). Overwinter mortality was not as strongly correlated with early winter SWEs ($r = 0.66, P = 0.16$). Overwinter mortality appeared to be related ($P = 0.03$) to late winter snowfall nonlinearly (Fig. 44), although a linear fit was also significant ($r^2 = 0.86, P = 0.008$).

Figure 43. Linear fits of indexed spring calf-cow ratio to late summer-fall precipitation metrics, Mount St. Helens elk herd, 2009-2013.
Figure 44. Non-linear fit of a spring overwinter mortality index to Z-scores for late winter snow water equivalents (SWE) measured at Spirit Lake, 2008-2013.

Combining the Z-scores for winter and previous late summer-fall weather severity (i.e., relative winter snowfall and late summer-fall droughtiness) into a cumulative weather severity index did not improve the fit (i.e., did not increase the $r^2$) to spring calf recruitment or overwinter mortality indexed in the spring (Fig. 45). Assuming the linear model, the residuals for the calf ratio index in 2011 and the mortality indices in 2008 and 2013 were larger than expected (Fig. 45). Because spring calf:cow ratios were unavailable prior to survey modifications made under this study, no data were available prior to the spring of 2009. The overwinter mortality survey predated our study, so an additional year of data (i.e., spring 2008) was available for overwinter mortality relative to calf recruitment (Fig. 45).
Figure 45. Linear fit of spring calf recruitment and overwinter mortality tallies to a combined index of current winter and previous late summer-fall weather severity. Marker colors: green = mild winter following normal summer; blue = normal winter and summer; yellow = normal winter and wet summer; purple = severe winter and normal summer; red = severe winter and droughty summer.
DISCUSSION

Our work was initially motivated by a need to better quantify elk abundance and demographics in the Mount St. Helens elk herd. Prior to our work, abundance estimates were attempted using the Sex-Age-Kill (SAK) model, a population reconstruction approach originally derived for white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) monitoring in the upper mid-west decades ago. The SAK model employs harvest data and additional demographic information (e.g., sex and age ratios) to reconstruct pre-harvest population size (Bender and Spencer 1999). Unfortunately, model outputs are very sensitive to assumption violations and parameter inputs that are rarely estimated well (e.g., the bull harvest mortality rate), often resulting in erratic performance and poor precision in the final abundance estimates (Millspaugh et al. 2009). Attempts to use the SAK model to estimate elk abundance at Mount St. Helens frequently produced biologically implausible results, and its use was eventually abandoned. (P. Miller, WDFW, personal communication).

As we initiated our work, it was apparent that the scale of the herd area made it infeasible to attempt to estimate total elk population size for the herd. Because these elk share a contiguous distribution with other elk in southwest Washington (e.g., Willapa Hills and South Rainier elk), the absence of a clearly defined biological population also rendered estimating total population size for the Mount St. Helens elk herd an indefensible goal. Therefore, we selected a 5-GMU subarea as our focal study area, with the intent of deriving estimates of population size or relative population size (i.e., an index) for this area. The 5-GMU study area represented an important core area for the Mount St. Helens elk herd that geographically captured most of the important elk management challenges for this herd (e.g., overwinter mortality, potentially excessive elk density, elk herbivory impacts, hoof disease). Despite that our study area was a limited subarea of the overall herd range, it was still a very large area that presented substantial challenges for quantifying elk abundance and for developing a long-term monitoring strategy.

In selecting a limited core subarea of the overall herd range, we recognized that estimates across years would be subject not only to demographic processes (i.e.,
natality and survival), but also movement (see Kendall 1999). Elk that were alive and present outside of our surveyed area in one year, might well be within the surveyed area boundary on a different year (see also Gould et al. 2005). Given that we surveyed elk each year in late winter / early spring, we expected movement to potentially influence our sampling year-to-year to some degree based on winter severity. This potentially added additional complexity to making inference about elk population trend, but alternatives were untenable. However, we believe the relatively large size of the area we sampled each winter reduced the effects of year-to-year movement and distribution on abundance inference, but did not eliminate these effects (see more on this below).

It was impractical, both fiscally and from the perspective of getting enough consecutive flyable weather days, to survey the entire study area with tightly spaced linear transects to obtain full, uniform coverage. Such an approach would have wasted a lot of resources flying large, heavily forested tracts where elk would be almost impossible to detect and where elk densities would be predictably very low (Starkey at al. 1982, Witmer et al. 1985, Jenkins and Starkey 1996). So, we adopted an approach wherein we attempted to fly most of the winter-occupied habitat with predictably moderate to high elk use and where elk would be at least modestly detectable. The use of an in-flight computer-based mapping system that allowed us to keep track of where we had flown and where the targeted habitat patches (e.g., clearcuts, meadows/wetlands, young second-growth, hardwood stands) were located allowed us to effectively move through our counting units with good coverage of areas that met our criteria. Clearly, we missed elk that were in densely forested conifer stands, but such stands far from more open habitat with high elk forage values were presumed to harbor low numbers of elk. Conifer stands that were in close proximity to more open habitats would also hide elk, but our assumption was that these elk regularly used nearby openings for foraging (confirmed by our radio-tracking data; see also Hanley 1983); on any given set of flights, these elk were assumed to have real, non-zero probabilities of being detectable in the open habitat components adjacent to the heavier cover patches.
We explored monitoring approaches that were oriented towards large extent surveys (i.e., data-based) rather than modeling approaches with less emphasis on actual field sampling (see Schwarz and Seber 1999 for a good general discussion of alternative designs). Both approaches we used—sightability-correction modeling and mark-resight—assumed elk groups often had detection rates <1.0. Imperfect detectability is common in aerial surveys of wildlife, including those of elk (Caughley 1974, Bartmann et al. 1986, Pollock and Kendall 1987, Samuel et al. 1987, Steinhorst and Samuel 1989, Gould et al. 2005, Barker 2008). Ignoring detectability predictably leads to biased estimates of abundance and other demographics, and good population monitoring programs must address the detection problem (Gardner and Mangel 1996, Pollock et al. 2002, Barker 2008, Tracey et al. 2008). Both sightability-correction and mark-resight models (an adaptation of mark-recapture methods; see White et al. 1982, Pollock et al. 1990) have been used previously in conjunction with aerial surveys of large ungulates (Samuel and Pollock 1981, Bartmann et al. 1987, Bear et al. 1989, Neal et al. 1993, Bowden and Kufeld 1995, Bleich et al. 2001, White and Shenk 2001, McCorquodale et al. 2013).

Regression-based sightability correction models are appealing because they require marked animals only during model development and usually require only slight modifications to data collection methods used in traditional composition surveys. The sightability correction model we derived is structurally similar to several other previously published models for elk (Samuel et al. 1987, Anderson et al. 1998, McCorquodale 2001, Gilbert and Moeller 2008, Jarding 2010, McCorquodale et al. 2013), wherein group size positively affected detectability of elk groups and canopy cover negatively influenced detectability. These are intuitive effects and suggest elk groups are missed more often when they are small and/or are shielded from view by trees and other concealing vegetation. Previous work in western Washington indicated that sightability model estimates were substantially lower than LNME mark-resight estimates (McCorquodale et al. 2013), and we had the same result at Mount St. Helens. Underestimation seems to be a predictable result with sightability models (Freddy 1998, Barker 2008), and appears to stem from the effect of low sightability groups; the method
does not account effectively for such groups (McCorquodale et al. 2013), but sightability models have validated well where most elk have reasonably high detection probabilities (Unsworth et al. 1990).

Mark-resight modeling represents a fundamentally different approach to imperfect detectability and is based on a well-developed body of literature (Otis et al. 1978, White et al. 1982, Pollock et al. 1990, Schwarz and Seber 1999, Barker 2008). Traditional sightability models assume the probability of detecting a group is constant over time (under specific levels of predictor variables) and the probability of sighting is estimated once, during model development; whereas, in mark-resight models, the probability of detection is potentially re-estimated during each resighting occasion. Mark-resight has proven to be a relatively robust and useful method for estimating abundance of large ungulate herbivores (Gardner and Mangel 1996, White and Shenk 2001,Gould 2005, McCorquodale et al. 2013), and the LNME model has been shown to well-suited for applications such as aerial elk surveys. However, at large spatial scales, models such as the LNME tend to be very impractical. The LNME model requires replicated surveys, physically marked animals (such as radiomarked individuals) perpetually, and the effort to individually identify marked animals observed during surveys. We believe the LNME model provided reasonable estimates of elk abundance during our work, and the detection rates we estimated were sufficient to expect a mark-resight application to perform acceptably (Neal et al. 1993). We do not believe, however, that mark-resight is a practical alternative for long-term monitoring of elk abundance on this landscape for the aforementioned reasons.

Our aerial survey data and abundance estimates derived from those data (both sightability model and mark-resight estimates) suggested a decline in total elk and total cow elk abundance during our 2009-2013 study. Trends appeared to vary spatially across our study landscape. Estimated abundance clearly declined substantially for GMUs 520 and 550, the west-most GMUs in our study area. Raw counts within counting units in GMUs 520 and 550 also suggested declines in total elk and total cow elk abundance within these GMUs were most pronounced in counting units furthest west. A declining trend was also suggested by counts and abundance estimates for
GMU 524. Across these units, declining abundance was most pronounced the last 2 years of the study, and data from spring 2013 were very important in defining the trend for several estimates. Estimated rates-of-increase were more strongly negative for GMUs 520, 524, and 550 using sightability model abundance estimates relative to mark-resight estimates, but this was largely because GMU-specific mark-resight estimates were only available for 2009-2012. By the spring of 2013, attrition of radiomarked elk left too few collared individuals available to support GMU-specific mark-resight estimates; the last collaring effort had been in February 2012.

Our data did not clearly indicate a decline in elk abundance, 2009-2013, in GMU 556, although raw counts and the sightability model point estimates for total elk and total cow elk abundance in the spring of 2013 were the lowest we observed for this GMU across the years of our study. Estimated rates-of-increase for total elk and total cow elk in GMU 556 were slightly above zero, and confidence intervals on these estimates included positive values, which would not support a conclusion that elk in GMU 556 had declined during our study. In GMU 556, estimated elk abundance rose in spring 2011 and 2012 relative to 2009 and 2010, then it declined in 2013. In fitting the rate-of-increase estimate to the data, the increase in 2011 from 2010 was largely responsible for the non-negative indicated trend. Raw counts for counting units west-most in GMU 556 suggested declines across the years of our study, whereas in the other counting units within GMU 556, only 2013 data suggested a decline.

Our data implied elk abundance was stable-to-increasing in GMU 522 during our study, in contrast to other parts of the landscape. Our 2009 estimates in GMU 522 were likely artificially low relative to 2010-2013 estimates because we adjusted the boundaries of our counting unit to include areas further upstream on the North Fork of the Toutle River between the 2009 and 2010 surveys. We consistently counted slightly less or more than 1,000 elk in GMU 522, during 2010-2013. In most winters, we observed elk groups upstream on the North Fork of the Toutle River all the way to the edge of the pumice plain near the volcano. Elk were typically fewer this far upstream, but they were consistently there, even during moderate-to-severe winters. Radiomarked elk movements did indicate some elk moved into GMU 522 from adjacent
GMUs, particularly from GMUs 524 and 556, to winter on the mudflow. It was apparent that our late winter counts of elk in GMU 522 were likely more affected by immigration of elk from other GMUs, than were counts in other GMUs. Nonetheless, we had no indication that wintering elk density in GMU 522 declined during our 5-year study.

Overall, our results suggested a substantive decline in elk abundance in our 5-GMU study area, 2009-2013. However, it was apparent that most of this decline occurred on the western half of the study area (particularly GMU 550 and the western 1/2 of GMU 520). For virtually every geographic scale of abundance estimates for total elk and total cow elk, the 2013 point estimate was the lowest estimate obtained 2009-2013, except for GMU 522 estimates. For total elk and total cow elk across the 4-GMU landscape (excluding GMU 522), 2013 estimated abundance was on the order of 30-35% lower than the 2009 estimates. GMU-specific sightability model estimates of total elk and total cow elk abundance were on the order of 60-70% lower in 2013 than in 2009 for GMUs 520 and 550, were ~40-60% lower for GMU 524, and were ~20-25% lower for GMU 556.

Relative to estimating absolute abundance, it was apparent that our sightability model routinely underestimated the numbers of elk at all geographic scales, compared to mark-resight estimates. Our sightability model estimates generally were about 50-70% of comparable mark-resight estimates. It was, however, encouraging to see that estimates from both methods supported very similar inference regarding trend. There was a very high correlation between corresponding sightability model and mark-resight estimates. There were data common to both estimates in the correlation analysis, although mark-resight estimates were a function of data from both replicate surveys and sightability model estimates were replicate-specific (i.e., half of the data reflected in the mark-resight estimates were missing from each sightability model estimate). The way detectability was modeled in each method was also fundamentally independent; mark-resight modeled the detectability of individuals and mark-resight modeled detectability of elk groups as a function of what caused some groups to be missed. Mark-resight modeled detectability apart from any causative factor. Also, rate of increase estimates
were reasonably congruent between the 2 methods when the data times series were the same.

All of this suggested that although sightability model estimates were consistently underestimates of *absolute* abundance, the estimates supported apparently reliable trend inference. Essentially, sightability model estimates appeared to be a good index of *relative* abundance. It seems unlikely that management decisions based on a sightability model-derived index of abundance would be much different than decisions based on mark-resight estimates of absolute abundance, based on our data and analyses. Previously, sightability modeling appeared to perform erratically in northwestern Washington and was judged inferior to mark-resight (McCorquodale et al. 2013). However, the Nooksack elk population—the population that was the focus of the McCorquodale et al. (2013) work—was very small compared to the Mount St. Helens herd, and annual surveys of the Nooksack herd were characterized by only a few groups (<40 typically) being observed. When few groups are observed, the occasional detection of a group or 2 with low predicted sighting probabilities (*i.e.*, supporting large model corrections) dramatically affects overall estimates of abundance derived from a sightability correction model. At Mount St. Helens, a large number of elk groups (an order of magnitude more groups than typical of Nooksack herd surveys) are observed during each survey replicate, and this reduces the influence of a small number of low sightability groups being seen, should that occasionally occur. That is, the contribution of what are essentially *outlier* groups to the overall abundance estimates are dampened when many groups are typically observed.

Estimated annual survival rates for cow elk on our study area from our best-supported survival model and model-averaged GMU- and year-specific rates across the full model set were relatively high (*c.* $\hat{S} = 0.84$-$0.86$) except for the last survival year (2012-2013) for all GMUs and cow elk in GMU 550 in all years. Annual adult cow survival of roughly $\hat{S} = 0.85$ would potentially support a stable to increasing population if annual recruitment of calves to yearlings was at least 30 calves per 100 cows, assuming 50% of the recruited calves were females. In a previous study (1988-1993), annual survival for radiomarked cow elk at Mount St. Helens was estimated at $\hat{S} = 0.82$.
(Smith et al. 1994). During the same study, radiomarked cow elk survival was estimated at $\hat{S} = 0.86$ on an Olympic peninsula study area. These rates are all lower than the $\hat{S} = 0.93$ annual survival estimated for radiomarked cow elk in northwest Washington (McCorquodale et al. 2013) for an increasing population with limited antlerless harvest and lower than estimates of $\hat{S} = 0.89-0.96$ for Roosevelt elk in western Oregon (Cole et al. 1997). Brodie et al. (2013) explored annual survival in a meta-analysis of 2,746 radiomarked Rocky Mountain elk ($C. e. nelsoni$) across 45 populations in western North America and derived estimates ranging $\hat{S} = 0.85-0.91$, depending on the richness of carnivore assemblages across landscapes.

Our best-supported survival models indicated substantially lower annual survival among radiomarked adult cows in GMU 550 in all years and in all GMUs during 2012-2013. These rates ($\hat{S} = 0.51-0.66$) would be associated with a declining population under even the best calf recruitment scenarios. This analysis indicated that during the last year of our study (2012-2013), adult cow mortality was high across the entire landscape. That this effect was likely real was further evidenced by the results of the spring overwinter mortality survey; the 2013 tally was the second highest in the last decade. The low survival estimate during 2012-2013 was also congruent with declines in raw elk counts and estimates of abundance stemming from the annual aerial survey in the spring of 2013. The last year of our study (2012-2013) was associated with a relatively high snowfall winter, a droughty summer-fall prior to winter, and a relatively high antlerless elk harvest in the fall of 2012.

Our tally of losses of radiomarked elk to non-hunting mortality was much higher the last year of our study relative to other years. This was congruent with the relatively high tally of unmarked elk deaths documented during the annual mortality survey and observations of a number of recently dead unmarked elk across the larger landscape during the aerial survey in spring 2013. As noted above, the environmental conditions—poor for both summer-fall and winter conditions—were predisposing for a challenging energetics scenario for elk. Based on post-mortem examinations of both radiomarked and unmarked elk, almost all of the winter-spring deaths were due to malnutrition. Some of these elk had clinical hoof disease of varying severity, but most
did not. Our data were not suitable for definitively addressing whether the presence of hoof disease substantively raises the risk of overwinter mortality for affected elk or not; our study design was not intended to address this question. Clearly, some elk are severely debilitated by the condition—others less so—leading to a seemingly logical assumption that some additional mortality risk is likely associated with advanced disease. The only information we have, however, derived from the fates of radiomarked elk, indicated that most of the small number of these elk known to have a hoof affliction survived for an extended time.

Annual survival among branch-antlered bulls, estimated from our models, was $\hat{S} = 0.56$. This rate was similar to an annual survival estimate ($\hat{S} = 0.59$) for bull elk managed under limited entry regulations in western Washington, a harvest strategy designed to yield modest bull mortality (Bender and Miller 1999) and was higher than bull elk survival estimated during a previous telemetry study at Mount St. Helens ($\hat{S} = 0.49$) (Smith et al. 1994). In a western Oregon study, bull survival was estimated at 0.54-0.58—very similar to our estimated survival rate—under point-restricted and any bull general season hunting regulations across 3 GMUs (Biederbeck et al. 2001). In that study, most bulls were killed before their 4th birthday. During our study, branch-antlered bull abundance appeared relatively stable across years; bull harvest regulations and permit levels were relatively static during our study, in contrast with antlerless elk permitting that was increased substantially to reduce the density of antlerless elk.

IFBF levels in late fall, estimated from hunter-harvested elk, were about 8.0% body fat for lactating elk and about 10% for non-lactating elk for most of our study area. Elk on high quality diets are capable of much higher fat accretion (Cook et al. 2004a, Bender et al. 2006, Piasecke and Bender 2009, Cook et al. 2013). On high quality summer-fall diets, even lactating elk are capable of IFBF levels in the 15-18% range in fall (Cook et al. 2004a). However, elk in western Washington and Oregon—presumably mostly Roosevelt elk or a mixed lineage of Roosevelt elk/ Rocky Mountain elk—are often strongly nutritionally limited (Bender et al. 2008, Cook et al. 2013). Among the west-slope elk populations for which condition data have been collected, elk at Mount
St. Helens appear to be relatively typical, based on our data from hunter-harvested elk and data in Cook et al. (2013) derived from live elk sampling via ultrasound in the fall. Fall data for live Mount St. Helens elk included in Cook et al.’s (2013) work indicate a bit lower condition than what we estimated from harvested elk, but derive from sampling only elk on the mudflow of the North Fork of the Toutle River in 2003 and 2005. In comparison to our fall estimates of ~8.0% and ~10.0% IFBF for lactaters and non-lactaters, Trainer’s (1971) elk condition data, based on kidney fat indices (KFI) for a large sample of hunter-harvested elk in western Oregon, suggested mean values of about 8.50% and 13.50% IFBF (converting KFI to IFBF using the transformation in Cook et al. [2001a]). Similarly, earlier work by Merrill et al. (1985) at Mount St. Helens early in the elk recolonization phase, post-eruption indicated fall IFBF levels of ~8.0% and ~10.5% derived from KFI data for lactaters and non-lactaters. These estimates are very similar to our fall estimates, the methodological differences notwithstanding. Note, however, that Cook et al. (2001a, 2001b) have demonstrated that condition assessments derived only from KFI can be problematic because of a strongly nonlinear relationship between KFI and actual IFBF. KFI estimates appear to work reasonably well at moderate levels of IFBF, but are less reliable as an index to IFBF at both high and low IFBF levels (Cook et al. 2001b). Our mean IFBF estimates for fall, derived from hunter-harvested elk, suggested modest, but not poor condition typified elk on our study area. However, the interquartile range for fall IFBF estimates included values of ~7.0% and ~5.0% for nonlactaters and lactaters, indicating strong nutritional limitation for a substantive number of elk within our samples.

Our late winter (Feb) estimates of IFBF from live-handled elk indicated mean body fat levels of a little less than 5.0% to a little more than 6.0% for nonlactaters and a little less than 3.0% to a little more than 4.0% for lactaters. Using mean IFBF values from the fall-harvested elk and the late winter live-handled elk would suggest that Mount St. Helens elk on our study area lose about half of their fall fat stores by the end of winter. By late winter, these elk are quite lean. Based on the data from Cook et al. (2013) for wild elk populations across the western U.S., nonlactating Mount St. Helens elk are fairly typical, condition-wise, of western Washington and western Oregon elk; elk with
evidence of late-season lactation at Mount St. Helens were among the leanest relative to other coastal and west-slope elk, but sample sizes for late-season lactaters at Mount St. Helens were small (Cook et al. 2013).

We estimated the overall pregnancy rate among elk we handled in Feb, 2009-2012, at just under 70%. That is clearly a suboptimal rate for elk on a good nutritional plane (Cook et al. 2004a). Prime-aged elk with access to quality forage during summer-fall typically have pregnancy rates in the mid-to-high 90% range (Cook et al. 2001c, Cook et al. 2004a, 2013). However, coastal and west-slope elk populations in Washington and Oregon are often nutritionally limited and display suboptimal pregnancy rates. Using a large sample of reproductive tracts from harvested Roosevelt elk in western Oregon in the 1960s, Trainer (1971) estimated the pregnancy rate across cow age classes at 50%, with the highest rate (59%) for prime-aged cows (ages 4-10 yrs.). Later, Harper (1985) reported a pregnancy rate of 57% for a larger sample of reproductive tracts from western Oregon elk (included the data from Trainer 1971) ≥ 2-yrs-old and a rate of 63% for prime-aged (ages 4-10 yrs.) elk. Collectively, the data in Harper (1985) represented sampling spanning 3 decades (1960-1980s) in western Oregon. Using reproductive tracts from elk harvested in southwest Washington (Willapa Hills) during the early 1970s, Kuttel (1975) estimated a pregnancy rate of 70.3% across all cows ≥1 year-old, and a rate of 74.1% if yearling cows were excluded. Smith et al. (1980) measured pregnancy rates from harvested cow elk on Washington’s Olympic peninsula and reported rates of 61.3% excluding yearlings and 53.5% across all age classes for data collected in the late 1970s. Cook et al. (2013), using ultrasound data from live-captured elk, documented pregnancy rates of 68.6-100.0% across 4 coastal elk herds in Washington and 76.9-100.0% for 8 west-slope Cascades herds in Washington and Oregon. Merrill et al. (1987) previously measured pregnancy rates for Mount St. Helens cow elk during 1982-1985 from a mixed sample of harvested and live-captured elk and reported a rate of 69% for 2-yr-olds and 87% for cows aged ≥3-yrs-old. In context, our pregnancy rate data for 2009-2012 indicated productivity on par—if not slightly better—with historic western Oregon and Washington elk data, but slightly lower than recent data for most western Washington and western Oregon Cascades elk.
herds. Our data also indicated slightly depressed productivity for cow elk at Mount St. Helens in recent history, relative to the lower density elk population on the same landscape during the post-eruption, elk recolonization phase in the early to mid-1980s.

Spring calf recruitment during 2009-2013 was highly variable, according to our survey-based estimates. Calf recruitment—standardized by the abundance of adult cows—is the result of 2 demographic processes: cow elk fecundity (productivity) and 1st year calf survival. Large herbivore populations, including elk populations, are typically characterized by relatively high and consistent adult survival, but substantial annual variation in juvenile survival (Coughenour and Singer 1996, Gaillard et al. 1998, 2000, Bonenfant et al. 2002, Lubow et al. 2002, Garrott et al. 2003). Demographically, population change is most affected by adult female survival in theory, but because of relative stability in adult female survival rates, realized population fluctuations are usually associated with dynamic juvenile survival (Coughenour and Singer 1996, Lubow and Smith 2004, Raithel et al. 2007, Harris et al. 2008). Eberhardt (1977) hypothesized that declining per capita resource availability (driven either by environmental fluctuation or increasing animal density) would affect demographics of large mammal populations following a predictable pattern: 1) declining juvenile survival, 2) increasing age of primiparity (female sexual maturity), 3) declining reproductive rates of adult females, and lastly 4) declining survival of adults. This ordering reflects the expected relative sensitivity of each demographic parameter to increasing food limitation, and empirical data have largely supported this hypothesis for large herbivores (Gaillard et al. 1998, Bonenfant et al. 2002).

Our data indicated very good recruitment in the spring of 2010 and 2011, even after attempting to correct for antlerless elk harvest. During these years, we commonly estimated recruitment exceeding 35 calves per 100 cows, and for some GMU-specific estimates during 2010-2011, >40:100. Calf recruitment this high—under the pregnancy rates we documented for radiomarked cow elk—seems exceptional. During our work, we consistently tried to guard against misclassification of calves and yearlings. When large herbivores are food limited, early body growth is typically impacted (Albon et al. 1987, Loison and Langvatn 1998, Mysterud et al. 2001, Cook et al. 2004a). Variation in
calf birth mass, calf gender, maternal nutrition, and first-year growth effects combine to yield a range of calf sizes by later winter. This and nutritional effects that carry over to yearling body sizes can result in substantial overlap in the sizes of large calves and small yearlings. We attempted to avoid misclassification of calves by continually trying to calibrate our perception of yearling cow size using the sizes of yearling bulls present in the elk groups we observed. We believe we were fairly conservative to avoid overestimating the numbers of calves, but it is still likely that some misclassification error occurred. That said, post-season calf:cow ratios exceeding 35:100 have also been previously documented for other western Washington and western Oregon elk populations that had pregnancy rates \( \leq 70\% \) (Kuttel 1975, Smith 1980, Raedeke et al. 1982, Harper 1985). Early in the post-eruption, elk recolonization phase, Merrill et al. (1987) estimated Aug-Oct calf recruitment in the range of 40-57 calves per 100 cows at Mount St. Helens when corresponding pregnancy rates were 31\% for yearlings, 69\% for 2-yr-olds, and 87\% for \( \geq 3 \) yr-olds.

The high calf recruitment we estimated for spring 2010 and 2011 was associated with favorable annual conditions. The winter of 2009-2010 was extremely mild, nearly snow-free, and the winter of 2010-2011 was modest relative to snowfall and mild relative to early snowfall. The summer-fall of 2010 was the wettest among all of our study years, with substantial late-summer, fall precipitation. The summer-fall of 2009 was not as wet overall, but had significant late-summer, fall moisture. Thus, our highest estimates of recruitment did occur under conditions that intuitively would favor good summer foraging conditions and minimal overwinter mortality, presumably conditions favoring higher than average calf recruitment.

In contrast with the 2010 and 2011 estimates, elk calf recruitment was lower in the spring of 2009 and much lower in 2012, 2013. Overall, observed estimates were in the 25-30:100 range for the study area and in the 25-35:100 range for all GMU-specific estimates except for GMU 522 during these years. Estimates for GMU 522 during these years were slightly lower than for the other GMUs. After attempting to correct the observed ratios for removals of antlerless elk via hunter harvest—removals that were substantial in fall 2011 and 2012—calf recruitment was indexed mostly in the high teens.
to 100 cows range for 2012, 2013 and in the 20-30-ish calves per 100 cows in 2009. Indexed recruitment in spring 2013 was the lowest—compared to other study years—for all GMUs except GMU 556; recruitment in 556 appeared similarly low in 2013 and 2009. Depressed calf recruitment in the spring of 2013 corresponded to high mortality among radiomarked elk that same year, high observed overwinter mortality of unmarked elk, and elk counts and abundance estimates that were also low. Weather-wise, the winters of 2008-2009 and 2012-2013 had relatively deep snow at mid-elevations, whereas the winter of 2011-2012 was relatively moderate for snow accumulation. The summer-fall of 2012 was characterized by almost no precipitation from July through September, and in 2011 overall growing season precipitation was even lower, with a droughty summer and fall rain only after mid-September. In 2009, the early summer period was very dry, but rainfall did occur throughout August and September.

We found statistical associations among several performance metrics (e.g., overwinter mortality, spring calf recruitment, fall body condition of adult females) and strong associations between landscape environmental metrics and some performance metrics (notably, overwinter mortality and spring calf recruitment). The environmental metrics we used (growing season precipitation and winter snow water equivalents with various temporal constraints) were selected as proxies for summer-fall forage production/quality and winter severity with intuitive implications for elk nutrition, energetics, and survival. We detected a particularly strong association of spring calf recruitment and late summer-fall precipitation across years. When droughty conditions prevailed during this timeframe, calf recruitment was depressed relative to years with a good precipitation pulse during Aug-Sept. Elk calves increasingly consume forage by late July, as they become less dependent on nursing for nutrient and energy intake (Robbins et al. 1981, Cook et al. 1994, 1996, 2004). By September they are obtaining a substantial portion of their calories from forage (Robbins et al. 1981, Cook et al. 1996, 2004). A finding that late summer-fall precipitation—a harbinger of fall forage greenup—affects spring calf recruitment, presumably by enhancing overwinter calf survival, is intuitive. Empirical evidence from tame elk feeding trials has also clearly implied that deficient summer-fall nutrition (potentially affecting both calves and their
lactating dams) reduces overwinter survival probabilities for elk calves (Cook et al. 2004a).

We also found a striking association between winter snow water equivalents, particularly from mid-winter through early spring, and the recent historic overwinter mortality index derived from carcass counts on a portion of the N. Fork of the Toutle River mudflow. A link between winter severity and overwinter elk mortality is intuitive; however, elk often tolerate deep snow conditions and/or winter nutritional deprivation elsewhere (Leege and Hickey 1977, DelGuidice et al. 2001, Garrott et al. 2003, Cook et al. 2004b); winter survival probabilities can be robust if elk store adequate fat reserves prior to winter onset (Cook et al. 2004a, 2004b). However, at Mount St. Helens, and possibly in other mountainous areas of western Washington and Oregon, strong nutritional constraints on summer-fall range may predispose some individual elk—particularly lactaters—to substantial overwinter mortality risks during severe winters (Bender et al. 2008). It would be expected that high elk densities would exacerbate the risk (DelGuidice et al. 1991). Overwinter mortality data we used came from a limited area in a low elevation valley bottom. The strong correspondence we found between a winter severity metric and mortality likely reflected not only the effect of winter severity on survival, but also the effect of winter severity on elk distribution. During heavy snowfall years, more elk are typically observed on the mudflow (P. Miller, personal communication), presumably having moved in from surrounding higher elevation forested areas, such as from GMU 524. Movements of radiomarked elk somewhat corroborate this. In severe winters, more elk deaths are indexed on the mudflow both because the sampled area holds many elk and because certain nutritionally stressed individuals succumb.

We did not find strong associations relative to the estimates of cow elk body condition derived from live elk handling in February and other performance or weather metrics. This was not surprising, because we had relatively small samples (110 total samples across 4 years), because of unknown lactation histories by February, and because condition assessed in late winter is subject to variable overwinter condition loss, depending on an elk’s fall body condition. Elk that are in better body condition in
the fall typically lose more body fat overwinter than elk in poorer condition (Cook et al. 2013, S. McCorquodale, unpublished data). Overwinter, some equilibration of body condition tends to occur for cows entering the winter at different condition levels, but this compensation is not absolute (i.e., does not typically erase all differences in fall condition) (Cook et al. 2004a).

Elk abundance (and density) has evolved considerably over the last century on the core landscape occupied by the modern Mount St. Helens herd. As late as the 1930s, the number of elk believed to occupy the Green, Toutle, and Kalama River drainages was less than 500 elk (Pautzke et al. 1939); only about 2,000 elk were approximated for that portion of southwest Washington roughly corresponding to the current Willapa elk herd area (Pautzke et al. 1939). Methods for estimating elk abundance were admittedly rudimentary 70 years ago, but presumably we can conclude that elk densities in this part of Washington were relatively low in the early part of the 20th century. Historic evidence of elk abundance on this landscape is sketchy, stemming from the lack of suitable methods to support valid estimates for many years, but it appears that the combination of fairly conservative elk management and active forestry across ownerships that created considerable early seral habitat (Starkey et al. 1982, Witmer et al. 1985) facilitated growth in elk distribution and density during the latter part of the 20th century. The eruption of the volcano in 1980 set the stage for a large area of forested habitat to revert to early seral habitat that was both highly preferred by elk and supported high fitness (Merrill et al. 1987). For a time, the post-eruption plant successional pattern across a portion of this landscape appeared to support both increasing elk habitat values and elk numbers, but eventually elk habitat potential and elk population trajectories diverged (Miller and McCorquodale 2006).

High elk density and declining habitat capability led to strong herbivory-driven modification to plant communities used by elk (see Riggs et al. 2000) and predictable declines in per capita forage availability and forage quality. Strong nutritional constraints for some elk on this landscape were eventually manifested as sub-par fat accretion patterns (Cook et al. 2013) and episodic overwinter mortality (Miller and McCorquodale 2006). This led to some of the management changes described earlier
in this report designed to reduce elk density. Reducing elk density was intended to decrease intraspecific food competition, increase average elk condition, and reduce overwinter mortality.

As described in this report, elk abundance did apparently decline over our 5-GMU study area during 2009-2013, and on parts of the landscape, quite substantially. We did not have data to thoroughly evaluate whether the density reduction had any appreciable effect on individual elk condition. Much of the density reduction was apparently effected during the last 2 years of our work, and we did not collect samples from harvested elk after the fall of 2011 and only handled a few cow elk for radiocollaring in Feb 2012. Clearly, a substantive winterkill during the last winter we report on (2012-2013), indicated that reducing elk density did not eliminate overwinter mortality risks, at least in the short-term. As previously noted, the droughty summer-fall of 2012 and the relatively severe 2012-2013 winter presented a poor energetic scenario for elk in this population, even at a reduced elk density.

Density-dependence, potentially operating on fecundity (i.e., productivity; Taper and Gogan 2002, Stewart et al. 2005), but usually through effects on non-hunting mortality (Guiness et al. 1978, Coughenour and Singer 1996, Lubow et al. 2002, 2004, Taper and Gogan 2002), is linked to the concept of ecological carrying capacity for large mammals such as elk (Fowler 1981). At high population density, intraspecific competition (both scramble and contest competition) occurs as per capita resource availability declines with predictable impacts to the most vulnerable individuals in a population (e.g., juveniles, senescent individuals, the infirm, those with high costs associated with reproduction). Density-dependent effects on survival have been demonstrated for juveniles in elk populations many times (Sauer and Boyce 1983, Coughenour and Singer 1996, Singer et al. 1997, Lubow et al. 2002, 2004) and similarly in conspecific red deer populations (Guiness et al. 1978, Clutton-Brock et al. 1987, Coulson et al. 1997). Density-dependent survival in adult elk has also been documented (Taper and Gogan 2002, Eggeman 2012), but less commonly (see also Sauer and Boyce 1983, Coughenour and Singer 1996). Density-dependent effects on adult female red deer have been shown to influence body size (Loison and Langvatn

Density-independent effects on survival, typically mediated through weather influences on energetics, have also been demonstrated for juvenile elk (Singer et al. 1997, Garrott et al. 2003, Lubow et al. 2002, Lubow and Smith 2004, Eberhardt et al. 2007) and even adults (Sauer and Boyce 1983, Coughenour and Singer 1996, DelGuidice et al. 2001, Garrott et al. 2003). Irrespective of population density, the effects of poor forage years and/or severe winters can apparently often reduce survival of juveniles and, sometimes, that of adults.

Our work implied logical causal links between density-independent effects of extreme weather (both summer-fall and winter) and calf recruitment and adult survival. These effects may have been exacerbated by density-dependent influences, but we cannot unequivocally demonstrate this. Overwinter mortality during the last year of our work, although high under the combination of a droughty summer-fall and a severe winter, was substantially lower than in the spring before our work began (2008), also a year with a droughty summer and a relatively snowy winter. The much lower apparent overwinter mortality in spring 2013, relative to 2008, occurred after the documented reduction in elk population size. Whether or not the change in elk density had anything to do with the differences in the overwinter mortality index between spring 2013 and 2008 is unclear, due to the absence of relevant corroborating data prior to the initiation of our work in 2009.

Reducing the elk population within our core study area was a logical prescription, given evidence of strong food limitation effects on elk body condition, modest pregnancy rates, strong herbivory effects on plant communities, and episodically high overwinter mortality. The degree to which a lower elk density will yield the desired improvements across these parameters is likely yet to be seen. Although the elk population has been reduced, it is reasonable to expect there may be some time lag associated with subsequent changes to elk habitats, and ultimately, to the restructured elk population. Although the relatively wet southwest Washington climate produces substantial
herbaceous biomass, particularly in early seral habitats preferred by elk, the proportion of this biomass that represents nutritious and palatable elk forage is actually quite small (Cook 2002, Geary 2013, J. Cook, unpublished data). Herbivory strongly influences the structure and composition of plant communities used by foraging elk (Augustine and McNaughton 1998, Riggs et al. 2000, Geary 2013), typically by reducing the density and biomass of preferred forage species and increasing the proportion of the plant community represented by species elk do not consume, or consume only as forages of last resort. These plant community changes can be dramatic under high levels of herbivory sustained for long periods, such as has likely occurred in highly preferred elk habitats at Mount St. Helens. Recovery of the herbaceous component, which has been depressed by herbivory, typically takes some time even after the plant community has been released from excessive herbivory. This has clearly been demonstrated elsewhere for red deer (Tanentzap et al. 2009). How long substantive recovery of palatable elk forage species is likely to take in these impacted habitats is difficult to predict, but it is unlikely to be immediate or very short-term.

Forsyth and Caley (2006) recently discussed what they termed “the irruptive paradigm” relative to large herbivores; this paradigm postulates that when released from harvest control, large herbivore populations characteristically grow past ecological carrying capacity, subsequently decline to a much reduced density, and then recover to a relatively stable density somewhat lower than the pre-crash high density. It is not clear if the Mount St. Helens elk herd actually exceeded ecological carrying capacity, despite some evidence of density-dependent effects on elk condition, and possibly, mortality. The density reduction that has recently occurred was also directed by management actions, not imposed solely by environmental constraints.

Other high-density elk populations have been associated with strong apparent herbivory-mediated habitat modification and have been surmised to be at or above ecological carrying capacity. For decades, the northern Yellowstone elk herd was managed within Yellowstone National Park under a natural regulation paradigm (Coughenour and Singer 1996); elk abundance rose substantially (Houston 1982, Eberhardt et al. 2007), herbivory modification to plant communities was apparent
(Houston 1982, Frank and McNaughton 1992), and population demographics were shown to be influenced by both density-dependent and density-independent processes (Houston 1982, Coughenour and Singer 1996, Singer et al. 1997, Taper and Gogan 2002). Occasional winterkills have historically occurred, mostly affecting juvenile elk (Houston 1982, Eberhardt et al. 2007); despite these observations, the evidence that these elk exceeded ecological carrying capacity prior to wolf (Canis lupus) reintroduction was considered equivocal, perhaps except for the short-term right after the large-scale fires of 1988 (Houston 1982, Frank and McNaughton 1992, Coughenour and Singer 1996b, DelGuidice et al. 2001, Taper and Gogan 2002).

Similarly, a high density elk population in and around Rocky Mountain National Park was previously surmised to exceed ecological carrying capacity, as evidenced by a strong herbivory signature on some plant communities, occasional winter losses of elk, and density-correlated variability in population growth rates (Lubow et al. 2002, Singer et al. 2002). However, Bender and Cook (2005) found considerable variability in individual elk condition, the population consisting of some elk at very high condition levels, some at low levels, and the average condition modest. This would seem to be similar to the recent situation at Mount St. Helens, in light of our data from hunter-harvested and live captured elk. Bender and Cook (2005) argued that the presence of elk at very high levels of condition, even if that did not typify most elk, did not support a conclusion that the population was above ecological carrying capacity at a landscape level.

A prudent near-term goal at Mount St. Helens would seem to be to continue to manage the elk population at a lower density with the objectives of promoting improved habitat condition, higher average elk condition, and reduced overwinter mortality. Again, such outcomes may operate with a time lag reflecting an evolving plant community response to reduced herbivory. Such management may well dampen the influence of density-independent effects—such as weather—on calf recruitment and overwinter mortality, but it is unlikely to completely eliminate sub-par recruitment and overwinter mortality in years with very unfavorable conditions. The degree to which the presence of hoof disease in this elk herd will complicate meeting management
objectives is unclear, pending additional research to disentangle the effects of the condition on elk energetics and population processes such as age-specific mortality and fecundity.

**MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

Our results indicated that sightability correction modeling yielded a useful elk abundance index that should perform acceptably to support management decisions about elk in the west-central portion of the herd area. This approach will undoubtedly underestimate true elk numbers, but applied at a relatively large geographic scale, the index appears to correlate well with actual elk numbers across a range of abundance. Emerging approaches, such as integrated population models (Buckland et al. 2000, White and Lubow 2002, Newman et al. 2006), may provide potential future direction that would facilitate the use of sightability model estimates as inputs to a modeling approach supporting inference about actual elk densities. Sightability modeling, applied to aerial survey data, is both practical and cost-effective.

Our work confirmed that the Mount St. Helens elk herd, at least that portion inhabiting our 5-GMU study area, has been food limited in recent time. Although this is consistent with data for other elk herds in western Washington and Oregon, under certain environmental conditions and elk densities encountered during 2009-2013, food limitation in this herd yielded occasionally substantial overwinter mortality. Reducing elk density was a logical management response, and was achieved via liberalized antlerless elk hunting. It is unclear to what degree reducing elk density will affect elk survival in years with poor weather conditions in the immediate short-term. It is anticipated that plant community recovery in habitats exploited heavily by elk in the past will likely evolve at an unknown, but longer time scale. Periodic sampling of organ sets from hunter-harvested elk would provide a mechanism to monitor for habitat-mediated changes in elk condition levels through time.

Population dynamics in the Mount St. Helens elk herd appear to have been influenced both by density-dependent and density-independent mechanisms in recent time. There is also presumed to be an interaction between these effects (i.e., density-
independent effects should be magnified at higher elk densities). Managing for a lower density elk herd is expected to modify the population level effects of elk density on intraspecific competition for food, but is unlikely to completely mitigate for density-independent effects of poor forage years (i.e., droughts) and/or severe winters.
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