



# Re-establishment of Viable Populations of Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse in Washington: Progress Report



Mike Schroeder, Mike Atamian, Richard Whitney, and Derek Stinson



Washington Department of  
**FISH AND WILDLIFE**  
Wildlife Program




**FISH AND WILDLIFE**  
Colville Confederated Tribes

## ABSTRACT

Declining populations and distribution of Columbian sharp-tailed grouse (*Tympanuchus phasianellus columbianus*) in Washington have resulted in serious concerns for their long-term conservation status. The overall population was estimated to be 886 in 2015, associated with 44 leks. Translocations of sharp-tailed grouse from ‘healthy’ populations outside the state were conducted to improve the genetic and demographic health of populations within Washington. The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, in cooperation with the Colville Confederated Tribes, translocated 368 Columbian sharp-tailed grouse from central British Columbia, southeastern Idaho, and north-central Utah to Washington State in spring 2005–2013. The release sites in Washington included Dyer Hill (south of Brewster in Douglas County), Swanson Lakes (south of Creston in Lincoln County), Greenaway Springs (southeast of Okanogan), and Nespelem (east of Nespelem in Okanogan County). Two of the release sites included state-owned public land and the other sites are Colville Tribal land; all are being managed for the benefit of wildlife, and in particular sharp-tailed grouse. In all release sites, sharp-tailed grouse declined through the year 2005, despite the acquisition and protection of habitat and ongoing habitat restoration efforts. Analysis of movement, survival, and productivity of the translocated birds are ongoing. Although it is too early in the process to determine whether the augmentations should be considered a success, the results to date have been promising.

*On the front cover: Siwash Valley, Okanogan County by Mike Schroeder; Sharp-tailed grouse at Chesaw Wildlife Area by Mike Schroeder; nest by Ben Maletzke at Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area; and illustration by Darrell Pruett. On the back page: illustration by Brian Maxfield.*

# RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF VIABLE POPULATIONS OF COLUMBIAN SHARP-TAILED GROUSE IN WASHINGTON: PROGRESS REPORT



**December 2015**

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Michael A. Schroeder, WDFW, P.O. Box 1077, Bridgeport, WA 98813  
Michael Atamian, WDFW, 2315 North Discovery Place, Spokane Valley, WA 99216  
Richard Whitney, Colville Confederated Tribes, P.O. Box 150, Nespelem, WA 99155  
Derek W. Stinson, WDFW, 600 Capitol Way North, Olympia, WA 98501

Contact: Michael A. Schroeder, 509-686-2692, [michael.schroeder@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:michael.schroeder@dfw.wa.gov)




## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project would not have been possible without the cooperation of wildlife agencies in Idaho, Utah, and British Columbia; we'd especially like to thank Randy Smith, Ron Greer, and Doug Jury. Some capture efforts in Idaho and Utah were done cooperatively with Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife who were obtaining birds for release in northeastern Oregon. Funding for this project came from the States Wildlife Grants program administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Mike Finch and Jim Bauer at Swanson Lakes WLA built the settling boxes for the release of birds. Numerous people assisted in capture, including Bill Burkett, Christian Hagan, Ron Greer, Randy Smith, Megan Schwender, Harriet Allen, Chris Sato, Juli Anderson, Thom Woodruff, Jeff Heinlen, Scott Fitkin, Dave Hays, Dan Peterson, Tiffany Baker, Donovan Antoine, Rick DeSotel, Eric Krausz, Kristin Mansfield, Dave Volson, Leslie Robb, Paul Wik, Luke Mallon, Kurt Merg, Mike Livingston, Ella Rowan, Howard Ferguson, Glenn Paulson, Richard Whitney, Howard Ferguson, and Rose Gerlinger. The BLM has been a great supporter and sought additional funds to improve this project, particularly with the support of Jason Lowe. Lisa Shipley, Kourtney Stonehouse, Todd McLaughlin, and Kevin White at Washington State University added a strong research component to this project. Monitoring included efforts by personnel from Colville Confederated Tribes, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), WDFW, Washington State University (WSU), and numerous individuals including Monica McFadden, Nick Hobart, Nancy Williams, Abbey Shuster, Aliina K. Lahti, Dick Rivers, Gary Ostby, Harvey Morrison, Kevin White, Luke Lillquist, Kim Thorburn, Randall McBride, Mike Finch, Sam Rushing, Brian Drake, Nate Lester, Kirby Wallace, Ann Brinley, Katie Wat, Adrian Rus, Dawn McSwain, Gary Wiles, Doug Pineo, Craig Sherwood, Kerrin Doloughan, Rich Parrish, Tyler Kollenbroich, Rose Salonikios, and Craig Cortner. Apologies to those that we have forgotten to mention.

## BACKGROUND

Columbian sharp-tailed grouse were historically found in many of the shrub-grass habitats of central and southeastern Washington (Yocom 1952, Aldrich 1963). Surveys have indicated that sharp-tailed grouse are virtually extinct everywhere except Okanogan, Douglas, and Lincoln counties (Fig. 1) (Hays et al. 1998, Schroeder et al. 2000, Stinson and Schroeder 2012). Remaining populations are small and localized within isolated areas of relatively intact shrubsteppe as well as Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) fields (Table 1). The total population in Washington was estimated to be about 886 birds in 2015 (Fig. 2). The population is associated with 44 active lek sites; 83 lek sites documented since 1954 are now inactive.



*Fig. 1. Estimated historic and current range of sharp-tailed grouse in north-central Washington (modified from Schroeder et al. 2000).*

Table 1. Distribution of habitats (1993 Thematic Mapper) in Washington in relation to sharp-tailed grouse populations (adapted from Schroeder et al. 2000).

Range or population	Proportion of area (%)					Total area (km <sup>2</sup> )
	Shrubsteppe <sup>a</sup>	Cropland	CRP	Forest-shrub	Other	
Total population	67.2	11.6	5.2	14.5	1.5	2,173
Tunk Valley	69.6	1.5	1.2	27.5	0.2	342
Greenaway Springs	78.7	3.6	2.1	14.5	1.2	340
Chesaw	46.0	0.0	3.9	49.9	0.2	70
Scotch Creek	69.3	4.7	0.9	23.7	1.4	79
Dyer Hill	42.0	44.5	12.0	0.7	0.8	308
Nespelem	65.7	5.1	6.9	19.6	2.7	513
Swanson Lakes	77.0	13.0	5.6	2.4	2.0	521
Unoccupied range	36.5	37.9	4.4	17.7	3.4	77,692
Total historical range	37.3	37.3	4.4	17.6	3.4	79,865

<sup>a</sup>Shrubsteppe includes shrubsteppe, meadow-steppe, and steppe habitats described by Daubenmire (1970).




Fig. 2. Estimates of population size for sharp-tailed grouse within Washington, 1975–2015. The Nespelem population (Fig. 1) was divided into the Nespelem area (north of Columbia River) and the East Foster Creek area (south of Columbia River).

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) has a goal to recover threatened populations of sharp-tailed grouse in Washington. The state has listed the species as threatened, acquired over 15,000 hectares of sharp-tailed grouse habitat, developed management strategies to improve their habitat (Anderson 2006, Hallet 2006, Olson 2006, Peterson 2006, Hoffman et al. 2015), conducted research on their life history requirements (McDonald 1998), conducted detailed analyses of population genetics throughout the sharp-tailed grouse range (Spaulding et al. 2006), begun experimental translocations to increase and expand populations, and published a recovery plan (Stinson and Schroeder 2012). The Colville Confederated Tribes (CCT) has pursued a similar strategy of acquisition and restoration (Berger et al. 2005, Gerlinger 2005, Whitney 2014). The BLM lists the sharp-tailed grouse on their Sensitive list with a goal of minimizing or eliminating threats and improving the condition of habitat. The primary management strategy for the WDFW, BLM, and CCT has been to improve habitat on publicly-owned or leased lands that are currently, or were historically, occupied by sharp-tailed grouse, and help facilitate enrollment of private lands in Farm Bill conservation programs. Habitat improvements include the reduction of grazing pressure, transition of cropland (mostly wheat) to grass-dominated habitats (such as in the federally-funded Conservation Reserve Program [CRP]), restoration of native habitat, and planting of key components such as riparian trees and shrubs.

Isolation poses a significant threat to the viability of remaining populations. Westemeier et al. (1998) described the reduction in genetic diversity and in population fitness over a 35-year period in a small, declining greater prairie-chicken (*Tympanuchus cupido*) population in Illinois. They reported that declines in fertility and egg hatchability correlated with a population decline from 2000 individuals in 1962 to less than 50 by 1994. Bouzat et al. (1998) genetically compared the Illinois population with larger populations in Kansas, Nebraska, and Minnesota and found that it had approximately 2/3 the allelic diversity of the other populations. Bellinger et al. (2003) found a similar reduction in genetic variation, though not in reproductive success, in greater prairie-chickens in Wisconsin. Their comparison of greater prairie-chicken samples collected in Wisconsin in 1951 with those collected from 1996 through 1999 revealed a 29% allelic loss.

Population augmentation efforts are one approach to address genetic issues associated with populations (e.g., lack of heterogeneity and small population size). In addition, by translocating birds from 'healthy' populations, a basic hypothesis can be tested. Specifically, is habitat limiting the growth and/or expansion of existing populations or is the problem related to the intrinsic 'health' of the birds? An increasing population trend following augmentation would support the hypothesis that a population 'health' problem existed. If the population size remains the same or continues to decline, and monitoring indicates that the translocated birds remained in the area and survived to attempt reproduction, data will support the conclusion that habitat quality and/or quantity is limiting population growth.

Experimental translocations in 1998, 1999, and 2000 were successful in augmenting one population of sharp-tailed grouse in Washington at the Scotch Creek Wildlife Area, northwest of Omak. Birds for this translocation were obtained from the Rockland area in southeastern Idaho (51 birds) and the Colville Indian Reservation in Washington (12 birds). Prior to the translocation, surveys indicated that the Scotch Creek population had declined to 1 lek with 2 displaying males. This population increased after three years of translocation (Fig. 3).




Fig. 3. Estimated population of sharp-tailed grouse on the Scotch Creek Wildlife Area in Washington before and after translocation of 63 sharp-tailed grouse in 1998, 1999, and 2000.

## WASHINGTON TRANSLOCATION PROJECT

The translocation effort in Washington was designed to follow recommendations outlined by Reese and Connelly (1997). Translocations of sharp-tailed grouse should include four basic stages to maximize opportunities for successful re-establishment or augmentation efforts (similar to Griffith et al. 1989). These include: **Stage 1**—Identify potential release sites based on quantity and quality of habitat on, and near, the sites. In addition, the historical presence and current status of sharp-tailed grouse near the release sites needs to be established. **Stage 2**—Identify source populations for translocation to the proposed release sites. This should include a genetic analysis. **Stage 3**—Conduct the translocation as efficiently as possible in a way that minimizes the length of captivity and maximizes survival and productivity. **Stage 4**—Monitor and evaluate the success or failure of the re-establishment or augmentation effort and determine future management efforts. This fourth stage is particularly important so that all translocation efforts, even those that are unsuccessful, will provide valuable information.

### Stage 1: Release Sites

The historical presence of sharp-tailed grouse throughout most of eastern Washington has been well established (Yocom 1952, Aldrich 1963). The current distribution of sharp-tailed grouse has also been documented with the aid of extensive state-wide surveys (Hays et al. 1998, Schroeder



et al. 2000). The grouse population has declined substantially over the past 40+ years. Genetic diversity and allelic richness are significantly lower in Washington than in populations in Utah and Idaho (Warheit and Schroeder 2003). Some of this lack of genetic diversity appears to be due to the small size and isolation of populations in Washington relative to other occupied areas.

Because of the declines in sharp-tailed grouse populations throughout Washington and the isolation and small size of the remaining populations, several locations were considered for translocation efforts. Four primary sites were identified based upon assessments of their size, habitat quality, and management potential (Fig. 1): Dyer Hill (south of Brewster in Douglas County); Swanson Lakes (southeast of Wilbur in Lincoln County); Nespelem (east of Nespelem in Okanogan County); and Greenaway (southeast of Okanogan in Okanogan County). Two of the release sites include state and federally-owned public land and the other sites are Colville Tribal land; all are being managed for the benefit of wildlife. The Dyer Hill site also was recommended by McDonald and Reese (1998) as the primary target for improvements in the statewide sharp-tailed grouse population. All of the release sites are recommended in the statewide recovery plan for sharp-tailed grouse (Stinson and Schroeder 2012, Fig. 4).

The release sites are clearly within the historical range of sharp-tailed grouse and until relatively recently have had healthy populations of sharp-tailed grouse. Dyer Hill is near the Central Ferry Canyon and West Foster Creek wildlife areas in Douglas County. These state-owned areas include approximately 4,000 hectares of potential sharp-tailed grouse habitat within a matrix of tens of thousands of additional hectares of private land, also with potential to support sharp-tailed grouse. Work is currently underway in the general area to restore 167 ha of old grain fields to shrubsteppe with a \$250,000 grant. In addition, 55 km of fence was removed in Douglas County, a portion of which was in the West Foster Creek Wildlife Area.

The Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area includes 8,094 ha, with an additional 518 ha lease of Washington Department of Natural Resources land. In addition, the BLM has purchased several properties adjacent to the wildlife area, providing an opportunity to secure connectivity of habitats among various agencies. The Lakeview Ranch is a 5,135 ha parcel located approximately 9 km north of the town of Odessa in southwest Lincoln County. Management of the area has focused on supporting wildlife habitat, seasonal livestock grazing, and wildlife-based recreational opportunities. Twin Lakes is a 6,201 ha parcel located approximately 26 km southwest of Davenport in central Lincoln County. Coffeepot Lake is a 377 ha parcel located 19 km west of Harrington in Lincoln County.

Since 1996, WDFW has restored almost 2,500 ac of former cropland in Lincoln County, and is currently working on restoration projects on BLM and WDFW lands totaling 461 ac. Fence collisions can be a source of mortality for grouse, and making them more visible can reduce collisions. In 2011-12, a BLM project marked 126 miles of fences, and removed 4.3 miles of powerline on BLM and WDFW lands in Lincoln County. WDFW also assisted the Lincoln County Conservation District with an ALEA grant to remove 20 miles of unneeded fencing in 2010-2011.




Fig. 4. Twenty-two Columbian sharp-tailed grouse recovery units and two potential recovery regions in Washington (Stinson and Schroeder 2012).

The CCT is acquiring and actively managing habitat east of Nespelem on the Colville Indian Reservation in Okanogan County. Although the Nespelem population of sharp-tailed grouse is the largest in the state (perhaps 200 birds), it has been declining for many years (Schroeder et al. 2000). All three of these potential release sites (Dyer Hill, Swanson Lakes, Nespelem) appear to be isolated populations with an inevitable future of extirpation without intervention.

Why have populations of sharp-tailed grouse been reduced or eliminated on the prospective release sites? Has subsequent management on the prospective release sites adequately addressed the explanations for previous declines in numbers of sharp-tailed grouse? There are numerous possible reasons for the sharp-tailed grouse population declines on the potential release sites. These include historical declines in habitat quantity and quality, potential increases in densities of predators such as common ravens (*Corvus corax*), great-horned owls (*Bubo virginianus*), and coyotes (*Canis latrans*) and isolation of remnant populations due to the lack of dispersal corridors between adjacent populations of sharp-tailed grouse. Some of the explanations for the declines have been directly addressed with management activities, in particular, habitat restoration. All the potential release sites have management objectives to conduct habitat restoration activities focused on sharp-tailed grouse habitat needs. These include replacement of poor-quality non-native grass/forb habitats with native shrubsteppe vegetation for spring and summer habitat, and establishment of shrubs and trees necessary for improvement of wintering habitat. CRP also has resulted in the conversion of large areas of cropland to potential sharp-tailed grouse habitat since the mid-1980's, although early CRP plantings have become monocultures of exotic grasses that need to be reseeded with native seed mix. However, because some of the remaining populations have endured severe 'bottlenecks' in abundance, we believe some of these populations have lost some of their intrinsic ability to respond positively to habitat improvements due to their reduced genetic diversity (Westemeier et al. 1998, Bellinger et al. 2003, Johnson et al. 2003). This possibility was consistent with the positive results for the 1998–2000 translocations at the Scotch Creek Wildlife Area (Fig. 3).

## **Stage 2: Source Populations**

The sharp-tailed grouse is currently divided into six extant subspecies (Aldrich 1963, Fig. 5); the New Mexican subspecies is extinct. Sharp-tailed grouse in Washington are within the Columbian subspecies range; this subspecies is distinguishable by its grayer color, smaller size, and shrubsteppe and mountain shrub habitat. Taxonomic differentiation of subspecies has been somewhat arbitrary and ambiguous.

Recent genetic analyses indicate that sharp-tailed grouse in Utah, British Columbia, Idaho, and Washington are more similar to each other than to any other region (Warheit and Schroeder 2003, Spaulding et al. 2006). Any population within these areas appears to be a genetically appropriate source population for translocation into Washington. The Columbian sharp-tailed grouse populations in British Columbia, southeastern Idaho and north-central Utah are appropriate populations from which we could translocate birds into Washington – based on population health and habitat similarity (Fig. 6).




Fig. 5. Distribution of sharp-tailed grouse subspecies in North America (modified from Aldrich 1963).

### Stage 3: Capture and Translocation

Sharp-tailed grouse are generally captured during the spring breeding period (early April) with the aid of walk-in traps on leks. All birds are weighed, measured, and banded with unique numbered bands. All females and a subset of males were fitted with necklace-mounted, battery-powered radio transmitters. In addition, sex and age are determined (Henderson et al. 1967, Caldwell 1980) and feather samples are collected for subsequent genetic testing. Birds are transported by plane or car in an individual box or a portion of a box that is small enough to contain the bird's movement. The bottom of each box is lined with a material to reduce contact between feces and the birds' feet.




Fig. 6. Location of source populations for translocations within the range of Columbian sharp-tailed grouse in relation to the target populations in Washington.

Prior to 2008, birds were released directly from boxes. Starting in 2008, birds have been held in settling boxes for a minimum of about 15 minutes prior to release, using a box design modified from those described by Musil (1989). This allows small groups of birds to be held and released together when the box was opened with a cord from a hide to minimize stress during release. All birds are released in the target location the same day they were captured, prior to darkness, or the following morning.. All birds destined for translocation receive a health certificate from a veterinarian that is accredited within the donor state. The US Department of Agriculture maintains a disease list for which all translocated birds are screened.

In total 329 sharp-tailed grouse were captured in Utah, Idaho, and British Columbia and translocated to Washington (Table 2). Forty birds were translocated from an area west of Clinton, British Columbia, 20 birds from an area north of St. Anthony, Idaho, 233 birds from an area near Heglar Canyon, Idaho, and 75 birds from north-central Utah. Birds translocated to the Colville Indian Reservation were released in the Haley Creek, Greenaway, and Nespelem areas. One hundred forty one (37%) of the translocated birds were females. All disease testing was negative.

*Table 2. Summary of sharp-tailed grouse translocated from British Columbia, Idaho, and Utah to Washington during 2005–2013 (no birds translocated in 2014 and 2015).*

Release location	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area	20	10	14	14	30 <sup>a</sup>	51	20	7	39	205
Dyer Hill	20	12	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	61
Colville Indian Reservation	20 <sup>a</sup>	11	12	14	10	0	9	26	0	102
Total	60	33	41	42	40	51	29	33	39	368

<sup>a</sup>The totals include birds that died in transport; one in 2005 and two in 2009.

## Stage 4: Monitoring and Evaluation

The success or failure of the reestablishment effort is evaluated on and near the release site (Toepfer et al. 1990). Although radio-marked sharp-tailed grouse have been monitored at all release sites, most of the effort has been focused on and near the Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area. The specific objectives include evaluation of sharp-tailed grouse movement, habitat use, productivity, survival, and population size. These evaluations help provide essential information to determine whether additional translocations, habitat improvements, release locations, and/or translocation methodologies are necessary. Because these data are currently being collected, the analysis included in this report is preliminary. Some of the information is in Stonehouse (2013) and Stonehouse et al. (2015).

### Movement

Radio-marked sharp-tailed grouse are located with the aid of portable receivers and 3-element Yagi antennas. Birds are located daily either visually or with triangulation during the first two weeks following release and at least once each week during the breeding and brood rearing season and twice a month during the fall and winter, particularly on the Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area. For triangulation, three or more azimuths are obtained, usually within 1.5 km of target transmitters and at angles-of-incidence greater than 35° and less than 145°. Error polygons are used to assess the ‘quality’ of the estimated locations. All locations are recorded with a GPS unit using Universal Transverse Mercator coordinates to the nearest meter and entered into ArcGIS. An attempt is made to avoid disturbance of birds, particularly at nest sites. Fixed-wing aircrafts are used to locate lost birds throughout the year.

Between 2008 and 2015 4,994 locations were obtained for 184 radio-marked birds released at Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area (Fig. 7). Sex, age and year released were considered in an analysis of maximum distance moved from the point of release for the Swanson Lakes’ releases. No significant differences in maximum distance moved was found between years of release (p-value 0.07). Females (12 km, SE = 2 km, n = 85) moved significantly (p-value 0.01) farther than males (7 km, SE = 1 km, n = 90). Yearlings (11 km, SE = 2 km, n = 51) tended (p-value 0.27) to move farther than adults (9 km, SE = 1 km, n = 124). The maximum observed dispersal distance from

the point of release was 89.6 km by a female released in 2006. We calculated minimum convex polygon home ranges for sharp-tailed grouse released at Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area. Home range size did not differ between adults (31 km<sup>2</sup>, SE = 9 km<sup>2</sup>, n = 115) and yearlings (34 km<sup>2</sup>, SE = 9 km<sup>2</sup>, n = 46) or between females (43 km<sup>2</sup>, SE = 14 km<sup>2</sup>, n = 75) and males (22 km<sup>2</sup>, SE = 5 km<sup>2</sup>, n = 86).




Fig. 7. Locations of radio-marked translocated sharp-tailed grouse released in the Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area from April 2005 through September 2015 (purple circles = observations of alive birds, red triangles = locations of kill sites).

### Habitat use

Vegetation at 26 nests of translocated sharp-tailed grouse were described between 2010 and 2012 (Stonehouse et. al. 2015). The primary protective cover was grass for 90% (mostly bluebunch wheatgrass, *Pseudelephantopus spicatus* and Sherman’s big bluegrass, *Poa secunda*), forbs for 8%, and shrubs for 2%. The vast majority of observations (97%) for radio-marked grouse were in shrubsteppe habitat types. Seven percent were in scabland, 4% were in shrubsteppe with dense (>25% cover) shrub, 14% were in shrubsteppe with moderate (5-25% cover) shrub, and 72% were in shrubsteppe with sparse (<5% cover) shrub.

## Productivity

Nest success was examined each breeding season (Schroeder 1997). Nests were considered successful if a minimum of 1 egg hatched. Specific evidence of possible predators was examined at unsuccessful nest sites. Brood success was estimated using radio-marked females that produced broods that survived at least 50 days following hatch (chicks can survive on their own after 50 days). Observations of banded and unbanded birds at leks were used to evaluate the recruitment of new birds into the population as well as the presence of birds that may have been on the release site prior to the first translocation. The latter situation may indicate leks which were previously undiscovered.

In 2009, only four hens were observed nesting, one hatched and the brood was assumed lost due to the hen dying prior to 50 days (Table 3). Since 2009, apparent nest success has varied from a high of 71% to a low of 29%. Brood success between 2010 and 2012 was high ( $\geq 80\%$ ), but dropped to 40% in 2013. There were only two hens remaining on air in 2014, both nested, one was successful, and fledged her brood. Overall apparent nest success and brood success are 50% and 70% respectively. No radio-marked hens were available in 2015.

*Table 3. Observed nest and brood success for female sharp-tailed grouse translocated to the Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area in Lincoln County, Washington, 2009–2014. No radio-marked birds were available in 2015.*

Category	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Totals
Nested	4	13	7	7	7	2	40
Chicks hatched	1	6	2	5	5	1	20
Chicks fledged	0	5	2	4	2	1	14
Broods with unknown success					1 <sup>a</sup>		1

<sup>a</sup> Hen slipped radio collar three weeks before 50 day flush.

Nest survival analysis assessing individual (e.g. hen age, years post release, etc.) and habitat effects (e.g. nest site vegetation, distance to roads, etc.) is being conducted by WSU.

Preliminary results indicate that nest age as the only parameter to have a significant effect (beta estimates 95% CI did not overlap zero) on sharp-tailed grouse nest success (Fig. 8; Adrian et. al. 2015). Using a 23 day incubation interval, mean nest survival was estimated at 47.6% (95% CI = 22.7, 68.3).

## Survival

Of the 203 birds translocated and released to the Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area at least 98 are known to have died (48%). Many additional birds are missing, have radio transmitters that are no longer functioning, or were not fitted with radio transmitters, so the number of dead birds is higher (Table 4).






Fig. 8. The effects of nest age on daily nest survival rates of sharp-tailed grouse nest in Lincoln County, WA, 2010-2014. The dashed lines represent the 95% Confidence Interval (Adrian et. al. 2015)

Females appear to have a higher mortality than males, 59% (53 of 90) of radio collared females are known to have died versus 48% (45 of 94) of radio collared males. Female mortality occurs most frequently in the spring, whereas male mortality is relatively equally distributed across seasons (Fig. 9). A Known-fate analysis run in Program Mark on 2005–2011 data indicates significant differences in annual survival by sex and age (Fig. 10) with adult females having the lowest survival, but did not indicate any significant seasonal survival differences.

Table 4. Summary by year of release of the status for 203 translocated and released sharp-tailed grouse in the Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area, Washington during 2005–2013 (no translocation in 2014). Likely causes of mortality are listed in Table 5.

Fate	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Alive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Outlived transmitter	3	0	2	2	10	7	10	1	7	42
Dead	5	6	9	9	14 <sup>a</sup>	25	9	6	15	98
Missing	9	2	3	3	3	10	0	0	2	32
Radio fell off	3	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	12
No transmitter used	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	10	19
Total	20	10	14	14	30	51	20	7	39	203

<sup>a</sup> Does not include 2 hens that died in transport

Table 5. Mortality of 98 radio marked sharp-tailed grouse by calendar year in the Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area, Washington, 2005–2014. No radio-marked birds were available in 2015.

Category	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total
Mammalian				1	3	2	1				7
Great horned owl						1			2		3
Raptor					3	7	8	2	4		24
Unknown	1	7	9	7	8	10	5	3	10	4	64
Total	1	7	9	8	14	20	14	5	16	3	98




Fig. 9. Distribution of 98 mortalities among 203 radio marked translocated sharp-tailed grouse in the Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area, Washington, 2005–2014. Two females that died during transport are not included.




Fig. 10. Known-fate survival analysis using Program Mark on 159 translocated sharp-tailed grouse in the Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area, Washington, 2005–2011.

### Population monitoring

Positive population responses and long-term population viability are the ultimate results desired from translocations. Radio-marked males are located during the morning period to determine the locations of temporary and permanent leks. An attempt is made to regularly monitor these leks without disturbing the birds. In addition, all potential sharp-tailed grouse habitat within at least 10 km of the release site is inventoried to estimate lek density and attendance of males (Connelly et al. 2003). Surveys are conducted during March, April, and May of each year

Concerted efforts were made to conduct surveys in the Dyer Hill (Fig. 10) and Swanson Lakes (Fig. 11) areas. As a result, apparent increases in the populations were detected at each site. It is believed that these observed increases are real and not an artifact of increased survey intensity for three reasons: 1) translocated males were among the displaying individuals; 2) the locations where ‘new’ leks were detected had been surveyed in previous years; and 3) an increase in number of birds was also observed during winter in nearby wintering habitats. Although it is still too early in the process to evaluate the success of the augmentations, there are ongoing efforts to monitor movement, survival, and productivity of the translocated birds. In the first few years of translocations to Scotch Creek, observed success was relatively small. It is hoped that the current translocation efforts will continue to show positive results in the future.




Fig. 11. Estimated population of sharp-tailed grouse on and near the West Foster Creek Wildlife Area (Dyer Hill) in Washington before, during, and after translocation of 61 sharp-tailed grouse in 2005–2008.




Fig. 12. Estimated population of sharp-tailed grouse on and near the Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area in Washington before and during translocation of sharp-tailed grouse in 2005–2013.

## LITERATURE CITED

- Aldrich, J. W. 1963. Geographic orientation of North American tetraonidae. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 27:529–545.
- Anderson, J. 2006. Swanson Lakes Wildlife Area Management Plan. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.
- Bellinger, M. R., J. A. Johnson, J. Toepfer, and P. Dunn. 2003. Loss of genetic variation in greater prairie chickens following a population bottleneck in Wisconsin, U.S.A. *Conservation Biology* 17:717–724.
- Berger, M.T., R.P. Whitney, R.A. Gerlinger, and D.J. Antoine. 2005. Colville Confederated tribes Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse Management Plan. Colville Confederated Tribes, Fish and Wildlife Department, Colville Agency, Washington.
- Caldwell, P. J. 1980. Primary shaft measurements in relation to age of sharp-tailed grouse. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 44:202–204.
- Collins, C. P. 2004. Ecology of Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse breeding in coal mine reclamation and native upland cover types in northwestern Colorado. M.S.Thesis. University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.
- Gerlinger, R. 2005. Sharp-tailed Grouse Restoration; Colville Tribes Restore Habitat for Sharp-tailed Grouse, 2003–2004 Annual report, project No. 200103000, (BPA Report DOE/BP-00006927-2). Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, Oregon.
- Gratson, M. W. 1988. Spatial patterns, movements, and cover selection by sharp-tailed grouse. Pages 158–192 in A. T. Bergerud and M. W. Gratson, eds. *Adaptive strategies and population ecology of northern grouse, Volume 1*. University Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Griffith, B., J. M. Scott, J. W. Carpenter, and C. Reed. 1989. Translocation as a species conservation tool: status and strategy. *Science* 245:477–480.
- Hallet, M. 2006. Wells Wildlife Area Management Plan. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.
- Hays, D.W., Tirhi, M.J. and D.W. Stinson. 1998. Washington state status report for the sharp-tailed grouse. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.
- Henderson, F. R., F. W. Brooks, R. E. Wood, and R. B. Dahlgren. 1967. Sexing of prairie grouse by crown feather patterns. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 31:764–769.
- Hoffman, R. W., K. A. Griffin, J. M. Knetter, M. A. Schroeder, A. D. Apa, J. D. Robinson, S. P. Espinosa, T. J. Christiansen, R. D. Northrup, D. A. Budeau, and M. J. Chutter. 2015. Guidelines for the management of Columbian sharp-tailed grouse populations and their

habitats. Sage and Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse Technical Committee, Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Cheyenne, Wyoming, USA.

- Johnson, J. A., J. E. Toepfer, and P. O. Dunn. 2003. Contrasting patterns of mitochondrial and microsatellite population structure in fragmented populations of greater prairie-chickens. *Molecular Ecology* 12:3335–3347.
- McDonald, M.W, and K.P. Reese. 1998. Landscape changes within the historical distribution of Columbian sharp-tailed grouse in eastern Washington: Is there hope? *Northwest Science* 72:34–41.
- Musil, D. D. 1989. Movements, survival, and habitat use of Sage grouse translocated into the Sawtooth Valley, Idaho. M.S. Thesis, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.
- Olson, J. 2006. Scotch Creek Wildlife Area Management Plan. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.
- Peterson, D. 2006. Sagebrush Flats Wildlife Area Management Plan. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.
- Reese, K.P. and J.W. Connelly. 1997. Translocations of sage grouse *Centrocercus urophasianus* in North America. *Wildlife Biology* 3:235–241.
- Rus, A. I., L. A. Shipley, K. F. Stonehouse. 2015. Nest Survival of Greater Sage-grouse and Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse in Lincoln County, Washington. Poster session presented at the Annual Meeting of the Washington Chapter of The Wildlife Society, Grand Mound, WA.
- Schroeder, M.A. 2008. Job Progress Report Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration: Upland bird population dynamics and management. Project #3. Progress Report. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.
- Schroeder, M. A., and C. E. Braun. 1991. Walk-in traps for capturing greater prairie-chickens on leks. *Journal of Field Ornithology* 62:378-385.
- Schroeder, M. A., D. W. Hays, M. A. Murphy, and D. J. Pierce. 2000. Changes in the distribution and abundance of Columbian sharp-tailed grouse in Washington. *Northwestern Naturalist* 81:95–103.
- Spaulding, A. W., K. E. Mock, M. A. Schroeder, and K. I. Warheit. 2006. Recency, range expansion, and unsorted lineages: implications for interpreting neutral genetic variation in the sharp-tailed grouse (*Tympanuchus phasianellus*). *Molecular Ecology* 15:2317–2332.
- Stinson, D. W., and M. A. Schroeder. 2012. Washington State recovery plan for the Columbian Sharp-tailed grouse. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.

- Stonehouse, K. F. 2013. Habitat selection by sympatric, translocated greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse in eastern Washington. M.S. Thesis. Washington State University, Pullman, Washington.
- Stonehouse, K. F., L. A. Shipley, J. Lowe, M. T. Atamian, M. E. Swanson, and M. A. Schroeder. 2015. Habitat selection and use by sympatric, translocated greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse. *Journal of Wildlife Management*. 79:1308–1326.
- Toepfer, J. E., R. L. Eng, and R. K. Anderson. 1990. Translocating prairie grouse: what have we learned? *Transactions of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference* 55:569–579.
- Warheit, K. I. And Michael Schroeder 2003. Genetic survey of Columbian sharp-tailed grouse populations in western North America. Unpublished Report, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.
- Westemeier, R. L., J. D. Brawn, S. A. Simpson, T. L. Esker, R. W. Jansen, J. W. Walk, E. L. Kershner, J. L. Bouzat, and K. N. Paige. 1998. Tracking the long-term decline and recovery of an isolated population. *Science* 282:1695–1698.
- Whitney, R. P. 2014. Modeling survival of Columbian sharp-tailed grouse on tribal landscapes in north central Washington. M.S. Thesis. Washington State University, Pullman, Washington.
- Yocom, C. F. 1952. Columbian sharp-tailed grouse (*Pedioecetes phasianellus columbianus*) in the state of Washington. *American Midland Naturalist* 48:185–192.

