

## Rangewide Status of Marbled Murrelet

The marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*) (murrelet) was listed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) as a threatened species in Washington, Oregon, and California in 1992. The primary reasons for listing included extensive loss and fragmentation of the older-age forests that serve as nesting habitat for murrelets, and human-induced mortality in the marine environment from gillnets and oil spills (57 FR 45328 [Oct. 1, 1992]). Although some threats such as gillnet mortality and loss of nesting habitat on Federal lands have been reduced since the 1992 listing, the primary threats to species persistence continue (75 FR 3424 [Jan. 21, 2010]).

### Life History

The murrelet is a small, fast-flying seabird in the Alcidae family that occurs along the Pacific coast of North America. Murrelets forage for small schooling fish or invertebrates in shallow, nearshore, marine waters and primarily nest in coastal older-aged coniferous forests. The murrelet lifespan is unknown, but is expected to be in the range of 10 to 20 years based on information from similar alcid species (De Santo and Nelson 1995, pp. 36-37). Murrelet nesting is asynchronous and spread over a prolonged season. In Washington, the murrelet breeding season extends from April 1 to September 23. Egg laying and incubation occur from April to early August and chick rearing occurs between late May and September, with all chicks fledging by late September (Hamer et al. 2003; USFWS 2012a).

Murrelets lay a single-egg which may be replaced if egg failure occurs early in the nesting cycle, but this is rare (Nelson 1997, p. 17). During incubation, one adult sits on the nest while the other forages at sea. Adults typically incubate for a 24-hour period, then exchange duties with their mate at dawn. Chicks hatch between May and August after 30 days of incubation. Hatchlings appear to be brooded by an adult for several days (Nelson 1997, p. 18). Once the chick attains thermoregulatory independence, both adults leave the chick alone at the nest for the remainder of the rearing period, except during feedings. Both parents feed the chick, which receives one to eight meals per day (Nelson 1997, p. 18). Most meals are delivered early in the morning while about a third of the food deliveries occur at dusk and intermittently throughout the day (Nelson and Hamer 1995, p. 62).

Murrelets and other fish-eating alcids exhibit wide variations in nestling growth rates. The nestling stage of murrelet development can vary from 27 to 40 days before fledging (De Santo and Nelson 1995, p. 45). The variations in alcid chick development are attributed to constraints on feeding ecology, such as unpredictable and patchy food distributions, and great distances between feeding and nesting sites (Øyan and Anker-Nilssen 1996, p. 830). Food limitation during nesting often results in poor growth, delayed fledging, increased mortality of chicks, and nest abandonment by adults (Øyan and Anker-Nilssen 1996, p. 836).

Murrelets are believed to be sexually mature at 2 to 4 years of age (Nelson 1997, p. 19). Adult birds may not nest every year, especially when food resources are limited. Recent monitoring efforts in Washington indicated that only 20 percent of monitored murrelet nesting attempts were successful, and only a small portion of the 158 tagged adult birds actually attempted to nest (13 percent) (Raphael and Bloxton 2009, p. 165). The low number of adults attempting to nest is not

unique to Washington. Some researchers suspect that the portion of non-breeding adults in murrelet populations can range from about 5 percent to 70 percent depending on the year, but most population modeling studies suggest a range of 5 to 20 percent (McShane et al. 2004, p. 3-5).

### Murrelets in the Marine Environment

Marbled murrelets spend most (>90 percent) of their time at sea. Their preferred marine habitat includes sheltered, nearshore waters within 3 miles of shore, although they occur farther offshore in areas of Alaska and during the nonbreeding season (Huff et al. 2006, p. 19). They generally forage in pairs on the water, but they also forage solitarily or in small groups.

### *Breeding Season*

The murrelet is widely distributed in nearshore waters along the west coast of North America. It occurs primarily within 5 km of shore (Alaska, within 50 km), and primarily in protected waters, although its distribution varies with coastline topography, river plumes, riptides, and other physical features (Nelson 1997, p. 3). Murrelet marine distribution is strongly associated with the amount and configuration of terrestrial nesting habitat (Raphael et al. 2015c, p. 17). In other words, they tend to be distributed in marine waters adjacent to areas of suitable breeding habitat. Non-breeding adults and subadults are thought to occur in similar areas as breeding adults. This species does occur farther offshore, but in much reduced numbers (Strachan et al. 1995, p. 247). Their offshore occurrence is probably related to current upwelling and plumes during certain times of the year that tend to concentrate their prey species.

### *Winter Range*

The winter range of the murrelet is poorly documented, but they are present near breeding sites year-round in most areas (Nelson 1997, p. 3). Murrelets exhibit seasonal redistributions during non-breeding seasons. Generally more dispersed and found farther offshore in winter in some areas, although highest concentrations still occur close to shore and in protected waters (Nelson 1997, p. 3). In some areas, murrelets move from the outer exposed coasts of Vancouver Island and the Straits of Juan de Fuca into the sheltered and productive waters of northern and eastern Puget Sound. Less is known about seasonal movements along the outer coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California (Ralph et al. 1995, p. 9). The farthest offshore records of murrelet distribution are 60 km off the coast of northern California in October, 46 km off the coast of Oregon in February (Adams et al. 2014) and at least 300 km off the coast in Alaska (Piatt and Naslund 1995, p. 287). Known areas of winter concentration include and southern and eastern end of Strait of Juan de Fuca (primarily Sequim, Discovery, and Chuckanut Bays), San Juan Islands and Puget Sound, WA (Speich and Wahl 1995, p. 314).

## *Foraging and Diet*

Murrelets dive and swim through the water by using their wings in pursuit of their prey; their foraging and diving behavior is restricted by physiology. They usually feed in shallow, nearshore water <30 m (98 ft) deep, which seems to provide them with optimal foraging conditions for their generalized diet of small schooling fish and large, pelagic invertebrates: Pacific sand lance (*Ammodytes hexapterus*), northern anchovy (*Engraulis mordax*), Pacific herring (*Clupea harengus*), surf smelt (*Hypomesus* sp.), euphausiids, mysids, amphipods, and other species (Nelson 1997, p. 7). However, they are assumed to be capable of diving to a depth of 47 m (157 ft) based on their body size and diving depths observed for other Alcids species (Mathews and Burger 1998, p. 71).

Contemporary studies of murrelet diets in the Puget Sound–Georgia Basin region indicate that Pacific sand lance now comprise the majority of the murrelet diet (Gutowsky et al. 2009, p. 251). Historically, energy-rich fishes such as herring and northern anchovy comprised the majority of the murrelet diet (Becker and Beissinger 2006, p. 470; Gutowsky et al. 2009, p. 247). This is significant because sandlance have the lowest energetic value of the fishes that murrelets commonly consume. For example, a single northern anchovy has nearly six times the energetic value of a sandlance of the same size (Gutowsky et al. 2009, p. 251), so a murrelet would have to eat six sandlance to get the equivalent energy of a single anchovy. Reductions in the abundance of energy-rich forage fish species is likely a contributing factor in the poor reproduction in murrelets (Becker and Beissinger 2006, p. 470).

The duration of dives appears to depend upon age (adults vs. juveniles), water depth, visibility, and depth and availability of prey. Dive duration has been observed ranging from 8 seconds to 115 seconds, although most dives are between 25 to 45 seconds (Day and Nigro 2000; Jodice and Collopy 1999; Thoresen 1989; Watanuki and Burger 1999). Diving bouts last over a period of 27 to 33 minutes (Nelson 1997, p. 9). They forage in deeper waters when upwelling, tidal rips, and daily activity of prey concentrate prey near the surface (Strachan et al. 1995). Murrelets are highly mobile and some make substantial changes in their foraging sites within the breeding season. For example, Becker and Beissinger (2003, p. 243) found that murrelets responded rapidly (within days or weeks) to small-scale variability in upwelling intensity and prey availability by shifting their foraging behavior and habitat selection within a 100-km (62-mile) area.

For more information on murrelet use of marine habitats, see literature reviews in McShane et al. 2004 and USFWS 2009.

## Murrelets in the Terrestrial Environment

Murrelets are dependent upon older-age forests, or forests with an older tree component, for nesting habitat (Hamer and Nelson 1995, p. 69). Specifically, murrelets prefer high and broad platforms for landing and take-off, and surfaces which will support a nest cup (Hamer and Nelson 1995, pp. 78-79). In Washington, murrelet nests have been found in live conifers, specifically, western hemlock (*Tsuga heterophylla*), Sitka spruce (*Picea sitchensis*), Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), and western red cedar (*Thuja plicata*) (Hamer and Nelson 1995; Hamer

and Meekins 1999). Most murrelets appear to nest within 37 miles of the coast, although occupied behaviors have been recorded up to 52 miles inland, and murrelet presence has been detected up to 70 miles inland in Washington (Huff et al. 2006, p. 10). Nests occur primarily in large, older-aged trees. Overall, nests have been found in trees greater than 19 inches in diameter-at-breast and greater than 98 ft tall. Nesting platforms include limbs or other branch deformities that are greater than 4 inches in diameter, and are at greater than 33 ft above the ground. Substrate such as moss or needles on the nest platform is important for protecting the egg and preventing it from falling off (Huff et al. 2006, p. 13).

Murrelets do not form dense colonies which is atypical of most seabirds. Limited evidence suggests they may form loose colonies in some cases (Ralph et al. 1995). The reliance of murrelets on cryptic coloration to avoid detection suggests they utilize a wide spacing of nests in order to prevent predators from forming a search image (Ralph et al. 1995). Individual murrelets are suspected to have fidelity to nest sites or nesting areas, although this is has only been confirmed with marked birds in a few cases (Huff et al. 2006, p. 11). There are at least 15 records of murrelets using nest sites in the same or adjacent trees in successive years, but it is not clear if they were used by the same birds (McShane et al. 2004, p. 2-14). At the landscape scale, murrelets do show fidelity to foraging areas and probably to specific watersheds for nesting (McShane et al. 2004, p. 2-14). Murrelets have been observed visiting nesting habitat during non-breeding periods in Washington, Oregon, and California which may indicate adults are maintaining fidelity and familiarity with nesting sites and/or stands (Naslund 1993; O'Donnell et al. 1995, p. 125).

Loss of nesting habitat reduces nest site availability and displaces any murrelets that may have had nesting fidelity to the logged area (Raphael et al. 2002, p. 232). Murrelets have demonstrated fidelity to nesting stands and in some areas, fidelity to individual nest trees (Burger et al. 2009, p. 217). Murrelets returning to recently logged areas may not breed for several years or until they have found suitable nesting habitat elsewhere (Raphael et al. 2002, p. 232). The potential effects of displacement due to habitat loss include nest site abandonment, delayed breeding, failure to initiate breeding in subsequent years, and failed breeding due to increased predation risk at a marginal nesting location (Divoky and Horton 1995, p. 83; Raphael et al. 2002, p. 232). Each of these outcomes has the potential to reduce the nesting success for individual breeding pairs, and could ultimately result in the reduced recruitment of juvenile birds into the local population (Raphael et al. 2002, pp. 231-233).

Detailed information regarding the life history and conservation needs of the murrelet are presented in the *Ecology and Conservation of the Marbled Murrelet* (Ralph et al. 1995), the Service's 1997 *Recovery Plan for the Marbled Murrelet* (USFWS 1997), and in subsequent 5-year status reviews (McShane et al. 2004; USFWS 2009).

## **Distribution**

Murrelets are distributed along the Pacific coast of North America, with birds breeding from central California through Oregon, Washington, British Columbia, southern Alaska, westward through the Aleutian Island chain, with presumed breeding as far north as Bristol Bay (Nelson 1997, p. 2). The federally-listed murrelet population in Washington, Oregon, and California is

classified by the Service as a distinct population segment (75 FR 3424). The coterminous United States population of murrelets is considered significant as the loss of this distinct population segment would result in a significant gap in the range of the taxon and the loss of unique genetic characteristics that are significant to the taxon (75 FR 3430).

Murrelets spend most of their lives in the marine environment where they consume a diversity of prey species, including small fish and invertebrates. Murrelets occur primarily in nearshore marine waters within 5 km of the coast, but have been documented up to 300 km offshore in winter off the coast of Alaska (Nelson 1997, p. 3). The inland nesting distribution of murrelets is strongly associated with the presence of mature and old-growth conifer forests. Murrelets have been detected >100 km inland in Washington (70 miles), while the inland distribution in the southern portion of the species range is associated with the extent of the hemlock/tanoak vegetation zone which occurs up to 16-51 km inland (10-32 miles) (Evans Mack et al. 2003, p. 4).

The distribution of murrelets in marine waters during the summer breeding season is highly variable along the Pacific coast, with areas of high density occurring along the Strait of Juan de Fuca in Washington, the central Oregon coast, and northern California (Raphael et al. 2015c, p. 20). Low-density areas or gaps in murrelet distribution occur in central California, and along the southern Washington coast (Raphael et al. 2015c, p. 21). Analysis of various marine and terrestrial habitat factors indicate that the amount and configuration of inland nesting habitat is the strongest factor that influences the marine distribution of murrelets during the nesting season (Raphael et al. 2015c, p. 17). Local aggregations or “hot spots” of murrelets in nearshore marine waters are strongly associated with landscapes that support large, contiguous areas of mature and old-growth forest.

#### Distribution of Nesting Habitat

The loss of nesting habitat was a major cause of the murrelets decline over the past century and may still be contributing as nesting habitat continues to be lost to fires, logging, and wind storms (Miller et al. 2012, p. 778). Due mostly to historic timber harvest, only a small percentage (~11 percent) of the habitat-capable lands within the listed range of the murrelet currently contain potential nesting habitat (Raphael et al. 2015b, p. 118). Monitoring of murrelet nesting habitat within the Northwest Forest Plan area indicates nesting habitat declined from an estimated 2.53 million acres in 1993 to an estimated 2.23 million acres in 2012, a decline of about 12.1 percent (Raphael et al. 2015b, p. 89). Fire has been the major cause of nesting habitat loss on Federal lands, while timber harvest is the primary cause of loss on non-Federal lands (Raphael et al. 2015b, p. 90). While most (60 percent) of the potential habitat is located on Federal reserved-land allocations, a substantial amount of nesting habitat occurs on non-federal lands (34 percent) (Table 1).

Table 1. Estimates of higher-quality murrelet nesting habitat by State and major land ownership within the area of the Northwest Forest Plan – derived from 2012 data.

State	Habitat capable lands (1,000s of acres)	Habitat on Federal reserved lands (1,000s of acres)	Habitat on Federal non-reserved lands (1,000s of acres)	Habitat on non-federal lands (1,000s of acres)	Total potential nesting habitat (all lands) (1,000s of acres)	Percent of habitat capable land that is currently in habitat
WA	10,851.1	822.4	64.7	456	1,343.1	12 %
OR	6,610.4	484.5	69.2	221.1	774.8	12 %
CA	3,250.1	24.5	1.5	82.9	108.9	3 %
Totals	20,711.6	1,331.4	135.4	760	2,226.8	11 %
Percent		60 %	6 %	34 %	100 %	-

Source: (Raphael et al. 2015b, pp. 115-118)

## Population Status

The 1997 *Recovery Plan for the Marbled Murrelet* (USFWS 1997) identified six Conservation Zones throughout the listed range of the species: Puget Sound (Conservation Zone 1), Western Washington Coast Range (Conservation Zone 2), Oregon Coast Range (Conservation Zone 3), Siskiyou Coast Range (Conservation Zone 4), Mendocino (Conservation Zone 5), and Santa Cruz Mountains (Conservation Zone 6) (Figure 1). Recovery zones are the functional equivalent of recovery units as defined by Service policy (USFWS 1997, p. 115). The subpopulations in each Zone are not discrete. There is some movement of murrelets between Zones as indicated by radio-telemetry studies (e.g., Bloxton and Raphael 2006, p. 162), but the degree to which murrelets migrate between Zones is unknown. For the purposes of consultation, the Service treats each of the Conservation Zones as separate sub-populations of the listed murrelet population.

### Population Status and Trends

Population estimates for the murrelet are derived from marine surveys conducted during the nesting season as part of the Northwest Forest Plan effectiveness monitoring program. Surveys from 2001 to 2013 indicated that the murrelet population in Conservation Zones 1 through 5 (Northwest Forest Plan area) declined at a rate of -1.2 percent per year (Falxa et al. 2015, pp. 7-8). While the overall trend estimate across this time period is negative, the evidence of a detectable linear decline is not conclusive because the confidence intervals for the estimated trend overlap zero (95% confidence interval [CI]: -2.9 to 0.5 percent) (Falxa et al. 2015, pp. 7-8) (Table 2). This differs from the declines previously reported at the Northwest Forest Plan-scale for the 2001 to 2010 period. This difference was the result of high population estimates for 2011 through 2013 compared to the previous several years, which reduced the slope of the trend and increased variability (Falxa and Raphael 2015, p. 4).

Population monitoring from 2001 to 2013 indicates strong evidence for a linear decline for murrelet subpopulations in Washington, while trends in Oregon and northern California indicate potentially stable or increasing subpopulations with no conclusive evidence of a positive or negative trend over the monitoring period (Falxa et al. 2015, p. 26). While the direct causes for subpopulation declines in Washington are unknown, potential factors include the loss of nesting habitat, including cumulative and time-lag effects of habitat losses over the past 20 years (an individual murrelets potential lifespan), changes in the marine environment reducing the availability or quality of prey, increased densities of nest predators, and emigration (Miller et al. 2012, p. 778).

The most recent population estimate for the entire Northwest Forest Plan area in 2013 was 19,700 murrelets (95 percent CI: 15,400 to 23,900 birds) (Falxa et al. 2015, p. 7). The largest and most stable murrelet subpopulations now occur off the Oregon and northern California coasts, while subpopulations in Washington have experienced the greatest rates of decline. Murrelet zones are now surveyed on an every other-year basis, so the last year that a range-wide estimate for all zones combined is 2013 (Table 2). Subsequent surveys in Washington, Oregon, and California have been completed during the 2014 and 2015 seasons. Summaries of these more recent surveys are presented in Table 3.

The murrelet subpopulation in Conservation Zone 6 (central California- Santa Cruz Mountains) is outside of the Northwest Forest Plan area and is monitored separately by the University of California as part of an oil-spill compensation program (Henry et al. 2012, p. 2). Surveys in Zone 6 indicate a small subpopulation of murrelets with no clear trends. Population estimates from 2001 to 2014 have fluctuated from a high of 699 murrelets in 2003, to a low of 174 murrelets in 2008 (Henry and Tyler 2014, p. 3). In 2014, surveys indicated an estimated population of 437 murrelets in Zone 6 (95% CI: 306-622) (Henry and Tyler 2014, p. 3) (Table 3).

Table 2. Summary of murrelet population estimates and trends (2001-2013) at the scale of Conservation Zones and States (estimates combined across Zones within the Northwest Forest Plan area).

Zone	Year	Estimated number of murrelets	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Average density (at sea) (murrelets /km <sup>2</sup> )	Average annual rate of change (%)	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Cumulative change over 10 years (%)
1	2013	4,395	2,298	6,954	1.26	-3.9	-7.6	0.0	-32.8
2	2013	1,271	950	1,858	0.77	-6.7	-11.4	-1.8	-50.0
3	2013	8,841	6,819	11,276	5.54	+1.3	-1.1	+3.8	+6.2
4	2013	6,046	4,531	9,282	5.22	+1.5	-0.9	+4.0	+16.1
5	2013	71	5	118	0.08	-1.0	-8.3	+6.9	-9.6
Zones 1-5	2013	19,662	15,398	23,927	2.24	-1.2	-2.9	+0.5	-11.3
Zone 6	2013	628	386	1,022	na	na	na	na	na
WA	2013	5,665	3,217	8,114	1.10	-5.1	-7.7	-2.5	-37.6
OR	2013	9,819	6,158	13,480	4.74	0.3	-1.8	2.5	+3.0
CA	2013	4,178	3,561	4,795	2.67	2.5	-1.1	6.2	+28.0

Sources: (Falxa et al. 2015, pp. 41-43; Henry and Tyler 2014, p. 3).

Table 3. Summary of the most recent murrelet population estimates by Zone (2014-2015).

Zone	Year	Estimated number of murrelets	Estimated population 95% CI Lower	Estimated population 95% CI Upper	Average annual rate of decline (2001-2015)
1	2015	4,290	2,783	6,492	-5.3 %
2	2015	3,204	1,883	5,609	-2.8 %
3	2014	8,841	6,819	11,276	nc
4	2015	8,743	7,409	13,125	nc
5	2013	71	5	118	nc
6	2014	437	306	622	nc

Sources: (Henry and Tyler 2014, p. 3; Lance and Pearson 2016, pp. 4-5; NWFPEMP 2016, pp. 2-3).

## Factors Influencing Population Trends

Murrelet populations are declining in Washington, stable in Oregon, and stable in California where there is a non-significant but positive population trend (Raphael et al. 2015a, p. 163). Murrelet population size and distribution is strongly and positively correlated with the amount and pattern (large contiguous patches) of suitable nesting habitat and population trend is most strongly correlated with trend in nesting habitat although marine factors also contribute to this trend (Raphael et al. 2015a, p. 156). From 1993 to 2012, there was a net loss of about 2 percent of potential nesting habitat from on federal lands, compared to a net loss of about 27 percent on nonfederal lands, for a total cumulative net loss of about 12.1 percent across the Northwest Forest Plan area (Raphael et al. 2015b, p. 66). Cumulative habitat losses since 1993 have been greatest in Washington, with most habitat loss in Washington occurring on non-Federal lands due to timber harvest (Raphael et al. 2015b, p. 124) (Table 4).

Table 4. Distribution of higher-suitability murrelet nesting habitat by Conservation Zone, and summary of net habitat changes from 1993 to 2012 within the Northwest Forest Plan area.

<b>Conservation Zone</b>	<b>1993</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>Change (acres)</b>	<b>Change (percent)</b>
Zone 1 - Puget Sound/Strait of Juan de Fuca	829,525	739,407	-90,118	-10.9 %
Zone 2 - Washington Coast	719,414	603,777	-115,638	-16.1 %
Zone 3 - Northern to central Oregon	662,767	610,583	-52,184	-7.9 %
Zone 4 - Southern Oregon - northern California	309,072	256,636	-52,436	-17 %
Zone 5 - north-central California	14,060	16,479	+2,419	+17.2 %

Source: (Raphael et al. 2015b, p. 121).

The decline in murrelet populations from 2001 to 2013 is weakly correlated with the decline in nesting habitat, with the greatest declines in Washington, and the smallest declines in California, indicating that when nesting habitat decreases, murrelet abundance in adjacent marine waters may also decrease. At the scale of Conservation Zones, the strongest correlation between habitat loss and murrelet decline is in Zone 2, the zone where both murrelet habitat and murrelet abundance has declined the greatest. However these relationships are not linear, and there is much unexplained variation (Raphael et al. 2015a, p. 163). While terrestrial habitat amount and configuration (i.e., fragmentation) and the terrestrial human footprint (i.e., cities, roads, development) appear to be strong factors influencing murrelet distribution in Zones 2-5; terrestrial habitat and the marine human footprint (i.e., shipping lanes, boat traffic, shoreline development) appear to be the most important factors that influence the marine distribution and abundance of murrelets in Zone 1 (Raphael et al. 2015a, p. 163).

As a marine bird, murrelet survival is dependent on their ability to successfully forage in the marine environment. Despite this, it is apparent that the location, amount, and landscape pattern of terrestrial nesting habitat are strongest predictors of the spatial and temporal distributions of

murrelets at sea during the nesting season (Raphael et al. 2015c, p. 20). Various marine habitat features (e.g., shoreline type, depth, temperature, etc.) apparently have only a minor influence on murrelet distribution at sea. Despite this relatively weak spatial relationship, marine factors, and especially any decrease in forage species, likely play an important role in explaining the apparent population declines, but the ability to model these relationships is currently limited (Raphael et al. 2015c, p. 20).

### Population Models

Prior to the use of survey data to estimate trend, demographic models were more heavily relied upon to generate predictions of trends and extinction probabilities for the murrelet population (Beissinger 1995; Cam et al. 2003; McShane et al. 2004; USFWS 1997). However, murrelet population models remain useful because they provide insights into the demographic parameters and environmental factors that govern population stability and future extinction risk, including stochastic factors that may alter survival, reproductive, and immigration/emigration rates.

In a report developed for the *5-year Status Review of the Marbled Murrelet in Washington, Oregon, and California* (McShane et al. 2004, p. 3-27 to 3-60), models were used to forecast 40-year murrelet population trends. A series of female-only, multi-aged, discrete-time stochastic Leslie Matrix population models were developed for each conservation zone to forecast decadal population trends over a 40-year period with extinction probabilities beyond 40 years (to 2100). The authors incorporated available demographic parameters (Table 5) for each conservation zone to describe population trends and evaluate extinction probabilities (McShane et al. 2004, p. 3-49).

McShane et al. (2004) used mark-recapture studies conducted in British Columbia by Cam et al. (2003) and Bradley et al. (2004) to estimate annual adult survival and telemetry studies or at-sea survey data to estimate fecundity. Model outputs predicted -3.1 to -4.6 percent mean annual rates of population change (decline) per decade the first 20 years of model simulations in murrelet Conservation Zones 1 through 5 (McShane et al. 2004, p. 3-52). Simulations for all zone populations predicted declines during the 20 to 40-year forecast, with mean annual rates of -2.1 to -6.2 percent per decade (McShane et al. 2004, p. 3-52). While these modeled rates of decline are similar to those observed in Washington (Falxa and Raphael 2015, p. 4), the simulated projections at the scale of Zones 1-5 do not match the potentially stable or increasing populations observed in Oregon and California during the 2001-2013 monitoring period.



These estimates of  $\hat{R}$  are assumed to be below the level necessary to maintain or increase the murrelet population. Demographic modeling suggests murrelet population stability requires a minimum reproductive rate of 0.18 to 0.28 (95 % CI) chicks per pair per year (Beissinger and Peery 2007, p. 302; USFWS 1997). Even the lower levels of the 95 percent confidence interval from USFWS (1997) and Beissinger and Peery (2007, p. 302) is greater than the current range of estimates for  $\hat{R}$  (0.02 to 0.13 chicks per pair) for any of the Conservation Zones (Table 4).

The current estimates for  $\hat{R}$  also appear to be well below what may have occurred prior to the murrelet population decline. Beissinger and Peery (2007, p. 298) performed a comparative analysis using historic data from 29 bird species to predict the historic  $\hat{R}$  for murrelets in central California, resulting in an estimate of 0.27 (95% CI: 0.15 - 0.65). Therefore, the best available scientific information of murrelet fecundity from model predictions and trend analyses of survey-derived population data appear to align well. Both indicate that the murrelet reproductive rate is generally insufficient to maintain stable population numbers throughout all or portions of the species' listed range.

#### Summary: Murrelet Abundance, Distribution, Trend, and Reproduction

Although murrelets are distributed throughout their historical range, the area of occupancy within their historic range appears to be reduced from historic levels. The distribution of the species also exhibits five areas of discontinuity: a segment of the border region between British Columbia, Canada and Washington; southern Puget Sound, WA; Destruction Island, WA to Tillamook Head, OR; Humboldt County, CA to Half Moon Bay, CA; and the entire southern end of the breeding range in the vicinity of Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties, CA (McShane et al. 2004, p. 3-70).

A statistically significant decline was detected in Conservation Zones 1 and 2 for the 2001-2014 period (Table 2). The overall population trend from the combined 2001-2013 population estimates (Conservation Zones 1 - 5) indicate a decline at a rate of -1.2 percent per year (Falxa et al. 2015, pp. 7-8). This decline across the listed range is most influenced by the significant declines in Washington, while subpopulations in Oregon and California are potentially stable.

The current range of estimates for  $\hat{R}$ , the juvenile to adult ratio, is assumed to be below the level necessary to maintain or increase the murrelet population. Whether derived from marine surveys or from population modeling ( $\hat{R}$  = 0.02 to 0.13, Table 4), the available information is in general agreement that the current ratio of hatch-year birds to after-hatch year birds is insufficient to maintain stable numbers of murrelets throughout the listed range. The current estimates for  $\hat{R}$  also appear to be well below what may have occurred prior to the murrelet population decline (Beissinger and Peery 2007, p. 298).

Considering the best available data on abundance, distribution, population trend, and the low reproductive success of the species, the Service concludes the murrelet population within the Washington portion of its listed range currently has little or no capability to self-regulate, as indicated by the significant, annual decline in abundance the species is currently undergoing in Conservation Zones 1 and 2. Populations in Oregon and California are apparently more stable, but threats associated with habitat loss and habitat fragmentation continue to occur in those

areas. The Service expects the species to continue to exhibit further reductions in the distribution and abundance into the foreseeable future, due largely to the expectation that the variety of environmental stressors present in the marine and terrestrial environments (discussed in the *Threats to Murrelet Survival and Recovery* section) will continue into the foreseeable future.

### **Threats to Murrelet Survival and Recovery**

When the murrelet was listed under the Endangered Species Act in 1992, several anthropogenic threats were identified as having caused the dramatic decline in the species:

- habitat destruction and modification in the terrestrial environment from timber harvest and human development caused a severe reduction in the amount of nesting habitat
- unnaturally high levels of predation resulting from forest “edge effects” ;
- the existing regulatory mechanisms, such as land management plans (in 1992), were considered inadequate to ensure protection of the remaining nesting habitat and reestablishment of future nesting habitat; and
- manmade factors such as mortality from oil spills and entanglement in fishing nets used in gill-net fisheries.

The regulatory mechanisms implemented since 1992 that affect land management in Washington, Oregon, and California (for example, the Northwest Forest Plan) and new gill-netting regulations in northern California and Washington have reduced the threats to murrelets (USFWS 2004, pp. 11-12). However, additional threats were identified in the Service’s 2009, 5-year review for the murrelet (USFWS 2009, pp. 27-67). These stressors are due to several environmental factors affecting murrelets in the marine environment. These stressors include:

- Habitat destruction, modification, or curtailment of the marine environmental conditions necessary to support murrelets due to:
  - elevated levels of polychlorinated biphenyls in murrelet prey species;
  - changes in prey abundance and availability;
  - changes in prey quality;
  - harmful algal blooms that produce biotoxins leading to domoic acid and paralytic shellfish poisoning that have caused murrelet mortality; and
  - climate change in the Pacific Northwest.
- Manmade factors that affect the continued existence of the species include:
  - derelict fishing gear leading to mortality from entanglement;
  - disturbance in the marine environment (from exposures to lethal and sub-lethal levels of high underwater sound pressures caused by pile-driving, underwater detonations, and potential disturbance from high vessel traffic).

Since the time of listing, the murrelet population has continued to decline due to lack of successful reproduction and recruitment. The murrelet Recovery Implementation Team identified five major mechanisms that appear to be contributing to this decline (USFWS 2012b, pp. 10-11):

- Ongoing and historic loss of nesting habitat.
- Predation on murrelet eggs and chicks in their nests.
- Changes in marine conditions, affecting the abundance, distribution, and quality of murrelet prey species.
- Post-fledging mortality (predation, gill-nets, oil-spills).
- Cumulative and interactive effects of factors on individuals and populations.

### Climate Change

In the Pacific Northwest, mean annual temperatures rose 0.8° C (1.5° F) in the 20th century and are expected to continue to warm from 0.1° to 0.6° C (0.2° to 1° F) per decade (Mote and Salathe 2010, p. 29). Climate change models generally predict warmer, wetter winters and hotter, drier summers and increased frequency of extreme weather events in the Pacific Northwest (Salathé et al. 2010, pp. 72-73). Predicted climate changes in the Pacific Northwest have implications for forest disturbances that affect the quality and distribution of murrelet habitat. Both the frequency and intensity of wildfires and insect outbreaks are expected to increase over the next century in the Pacific Northwest (Littell et al. 2010, p. 130).

One of the largest projected effects on Pacific Northwest forests is likely to come from an increase in fire frequency, duration, and severity. Westerling et al. (2006, pp. 940-941) analyzed wildfires and found that since the mid-1980s, wildfire frequency in western forests has nearly quadrupled compared to the average of the period from 1970-1986. The total area burned is more than 6.5 times the previous level and the average length of the fire season during 1987-2003 was 78 days longer compared to 1978-1986 (Westerling et al. 2006, p. 941). The area burned annually by wildfires in the Pacific Northwest is expected to double or triple by the 2080s (Littell et al. 2010, p. 140). Wildfires are now the primary cause of murrelet habitat loss on Federal lands, with over 21,000 acres of habitat loss attributed to wildfires from 1993 to 2012 (Raphael et al. 2015b, p. 123). Climate change is likely to further exacerbate some existing threats such as the projected potential for increased habitat loss from drought related fire, mortality, insects and disease, and increases in extreme flooding, landslides and windthrow events in the short-term (10 to 30 years).

Within the marine environment, effects on the murrelet food supply (amount, distribution, quality) provide the most likely mechanism for climate change impacts to murrelets. Studies in British Columbia (Norris et al. 2007) and California (Becker and Beissinger 2006) have documented long-term declines in the quality of murrelet prey, and one of these studies (Becker and Beissinger 2006, p. 475) linked variation in coastal water temperatures, murrelet prey quality during pre-breeding, and murrelet reproductive success. These studies indicate that murrelet recovery may be affected as long-term trends in ocean climate conditions affect prey resources

and murrelet reproductive rates. While seabirds such as the murrelet have life-history strategies adapted to variable marine environments, ongoing and future climate change could present changes of a rapidity and scope outside the adaptive range of murrelets (USFWS 2009, p. 46).

### **Conservation Needs of the Species**

Reestablishing an abundant supply of high quality murrelet nesting habitat is a vital conservation need given the extensive removal during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. However, there are other conservation imperatives. Foremost among the conservation needs are those in the marine and terrestrial environments to increase murrelet fecundity by increasing the number of breeding adults, improving murrelet nest success (due to low nestling survival and low fledging rates), and reducing anthropogenic stressors that reduce individual fitness or lead to mortality.

The overall reproductive success (fecundity) of murrelets is directly influenced by nest predation rates (reducing nestling survival rates) in the terrestrial environment and an abundant supply of high quality prey in the marine environment during the breeding season (improving potential nestling survival and fledging rates). Anthropogenic stressors affecting murrelet fitness and survival in the marine environment are associated with commercial and tribal gillnets, derelict fishing gear, oil spills, and high underwater sound pressure (energy) levels generated by pile-driving and underwater detonations (that can be lethal or reduce individual fitness).

General criteria for murrelet recovery (delisting) were established at the inception of the Plan and they have not been met. More specific delisting criteria are expected in the future to address population, demographic, and habitat based recovery criteria (USFWS 1997, p. 114-115). The general criteria include:

- documenting stable or increasing population trends in population size, density, and productivity in four of the six Conservation Zones for a 10-year period and
- implementing management and monitoring strategies in the marine and terrestrial environments to ensure protection of murrelets for at least 50 years.

Thus, increasing murrelet reproductive success and reducing the frequency, magnitude, or duration of any anthropogenic stressor that directly or indirectly affects murrelet fitness or survival in the marine and terrestrial environments are the priority conservation needs of the species. The Service estimates recovery of the murrelet will require at least 50 years (USFWS 1997)

### **Recovery Plan**

The Marbled Murrelet Recovery Plan outlines the conservation strategy with both short- and long-term objectives. The Plan places special emphasis on the terrestrial environment for habitat-based recovery actions due to nesting occurring in inland forests.

In the short-term, specific actions identified as necessary to stabilize the populations include protecting occupied habitat and minimizing the loss of unoccupied but suitable habitat (USFWS 1997, p. 119). Specific actions include maintaining large blocks of suitable habitat, maintaining

and enhancing buffer habitat, decreasing risks of nesting habitat loss due to fire and windthrow, reducing predation, and minimizing disturbance. The designation of critical habitat also contributes towards the initial objective of stabilizing the population size through the maintenance and protection of occupied habitat and minimizing the loss of unoccupied but suitable habitat.

Long-term conservation needs identified in the Plan include:

- increasing productivity (abundance, the ratio of juveniles to adults, and nest success) and population size;
- increasing the amount (stand size and number of stands), quality, and distribution of suitable nesting habitat;
- protecting and improving the quality of the marine environment; and
- reducing or eliminating threats to survivorship by reducing predation in the terrestrial environment and anthropogenic sources of mortality at sea.

#### *Recovery Zones in Washington*

Conservation Zones 1 and 2 extend inland 50 miles from marine waters. Conservation Zone 1 includes all the waters of Puget Sound and most waters of the Strait of Juan de Fuca south of the U.S.-Canadian border and the Puget Sound, including the north Cascade Mountains and the northern and eastern sections of the Olympic Peninsula. Conservation Zone 2 includes marine waters within 1.2 miles (2 km) off the Pacific Ocean shoreline, with the northern terminus immediately south of the U.S.-Canadian border near Cape Flattery along the midpoint of the Olympic Peninsula and extending to the southern border of Washington (the Columbia River) (USFWS 1997, pg. 126).

Lands considered essential for the recovery of the murrelet within Conservation Zones 1 and 2 are 1) any suitable habitat in a Late Successional Reserve (LSR), 2) all suitable habitat located in the Olympic Adaptive Management Area, 3) large areas of suitable nesting habitat outside of LSRs on Federal lands, such as habitat located in the Olympic National Park, 4) suitable habitat on State lands within 40 miles off the coast, and 5) habitat within occupied murrelet sites on private lands (USFWS 1997).

#### **Summary**

At the range-wide scale, murrelet populations have declined at an average rate of 1.2 percent per year since 2001. The most recent population estimate for the entire Northwest Forest Plan area in 2013 was 19,700 murrelets (95 percent CI: 15,400 to 23,900 birds) (Falxa et al. 2015, p. 7). The largest and most stable murrelet subpopulations now occur off the Oregon and northern California coasts, while subpopulations in Washington have experienced the greatest rates of decline (-4.4 percent per year; 95% CI: -6.8 to -1.9%) (Lance and Pearson 2016, p. 5).

Monitoring of murrelet nesting habitat within the Northwest Forest Plan area indicates nesting habitat declined from an estimated 2.53 million acres in 1993 to an estimated 2.23 million acres in 2012, a decline of about 12.1 percent (Raphael et al. 2015b, p. 89). Murrelet population size is strongly and positively correlated with amount of nesting habitat, suggesting that conservation of remaining nesting habitat and restoration of currently unsuitable habitat is key to murrelet recovery (Raphael et al. 2011, p. iii).

The species decline has been largely caused by extensive removal of late-successional and old growth coastal forest which serves as nesting habitat for murrelets. Additional factors in its decline include high nest-site predation rates and human-induced mortality in the marine environment from disturbance, gillnets, and oil spills. In addition, murrelet reproductive success is strongly correlated with the abundance of marine prey species. Overfishing and oceanographic variation from climate events have likely altered both the quality and quantity of murrelet prey species (USFWS 2009, p. 67).

Although some threats have been reduced, most continue unabated and new threats now strain the ability of the murrelet to successfully reproduce. Threats continue to contribute to murrelet population declines through adult and juvenile mortality and reduced reproduction. Therefore, given the current status of the species and background risks facing the species, it is reasonable to assume that murrelet populations in Conservation Zones 1 and 2 and throughout the listed range have low resilience to deleterious population-level effects and are at high risk of continual declines. Activities which degrade the existing conditions of occupied nest habitat or reduce adult survivorship and/or nest success of murrelets will be of greatest consequence to the species. Actions resulting in the further loss of occupied nesting habitat, mortality to breeding adults, eggs, or nestlings will reinforce the current murrelet population decline throughout the coterminous United States.




Figure 1. The six geographic areas identified as Conservation Zones in the recovery plan for the marbled murrelet (USFWS 1997). Note: “Plan boundary” refers to the Northwest Forest Plan. Figure adapted from Huff et al. (2006, p. 6).

## LITERATURE CITED

- Adams, J., J. Felis, J.W. Mason, and J.Y. Takekawa. 2014. Pacific Continental Shelf Environmental Assessment (PaCSEA): aerial seabird and marine mammal surveys off northern California, Oregon, and Washington, 2011- 2012. GIS Resource Database: U.S. Geological Survey Data Release. May 13, 2014, Available at <https://www.sciencebase.gov/catalog/item/imap/5577361ee4b032353cba3c46?view=old> > (Date Accessed: September 16, 2015).
- Becker, B.H., and S.R. Beissinger. 2003. Scale-dependent habitat selection by a nearshore seabird, the marbled murrelet, in a highly dynamic upwelling system. *Marine Ecology-Progress Series* 256:243-255.
- Becker, B.H., and S.R. Beissinger. 2006. Centennial decline in the trophic level of an endangered seabird after fisheries decline. *Conservation Biology* 20(2):470-479.
- Beissinger, S.R. 1995. Population trends of the marbled murrelet projected from demographic analyses. Pages 385-393 *In* C.J. Ralph, G.L. Hunt, M.G. Raphael, and J.F. Piatt, eds. *Ecology and conservation of the marbled murrelet*. General Technical Report: PSW-GTW-152, Pacific Southwest Experimental Station, U.S. Forest Service, Albany, California.
- Beissinger, S.R., and M.Z. Peery. 2007. Reconstructing the historic demography of an endangered seabird. *Ecology* 88(2):296-305.
- Bloxton, T.D., and M.G. Raphael. 2005. Breeding ecology of the marbled murrelet in Washington State: 2004 Season Summary, A report to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Western Washington Fish and Wildlife Office, Lacey, Washington; Pacific Northwest Research Station, U.S. Forest Service, Olympia, Washington. 14 pp.
- Bloxton, T.D., and M.G. Raphael. 2006. At-sea movements of radio-tagged marbled murrelets in Washington. *Northwestern Naturalist* 87(2):162-162.
- Bradley, R.W., F. Cooke, L.W. Loughheed, and W.S. Boyd. 2004. Inferring breeding success through radiotelemetry in the marbled murrelet. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 68(2):318-331.
- Burger, A.E., I.A. Manley, M.P. Silvergieter, D.B. Lank, K.M. Jordan, T.D. Bloxton, and M.G. Raphael. 2009. Re-use of nest sites by Marbled Murrelets (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*) in British Columbia. *Northwestern Naturalist* 90(3):217-226.
- Cam, E., L.W. Loughheed, R.W. Bradley, and F. Cooke. 2003. Demographic assessment of a marbled murrelet population from capture-recapture data. *Conservation Biology* 17(4):1118-1126.
- Crescent Coastal Research. 2008. Population and productivity monitoring of marbled murrelets in Oregon during 2008, Final Report to USFWS Oregon State Office, Portland, Oregon, December 2008. 13 pp.

- Day, R.H., and D.A. Nigro. 2000. Feeding ecology of Kittlitz's and marbled murrelets in Prince William Sound, Alaska. *Waterbirds* 23(1):1-14.
- De Santo, T.L., and S.K. Nelson. 1995. Comparative reproductive ecology of the Auks (Family Alcidae) with emphasis on the marbled murrelet. Pages 33-47 in C.J. Ralph, G.L. Hunt, M.G. Raphael, and J.F. Piatt (eds.). *Ecology and conservation of the marbled murrelet*. Pacific Southwest Experimental Station, U.S. Forest Service, PSW-GTW-152., Albany, California. 14 pp.
- Divoky, G.J., and M. Horton. 1995. Breeding and natal dispersal, nest habitat loss and implications for marbled murrelet populations. Pages 83-87 *In* C.J. Ralph, G.L. Hunt, M.G. Raphael, and J.F. Piatt, eds. *Ecology and conservation of the marbled murrelet*. General Technical Report. PSW-GTW-152, Pacific Southwest Experimental Station, U.S. Forest Service, Albany, California.
- Evans Mack, D., W.P. Ritchie, S.K. Nelson, E. Kuo-Harrison, P. Harrison, and T.E. Hamer. 2003. Methods for surveying marbled murrelets in forests: a revised protocol for land management and research. Pacific Seabird Group unpublished document available at <http://www.pacificseabirdgroup.org>, Seattle, Washington, January 6, 2003. 81 pp.
- Falxa, G.A., and M.G. Raphael. 2015. Northwest Forest Plan—The first 20 years (1994-2013): status and trend of marbled murrelet populations and nesting habitat. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station., Draft Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-XXXX., Portland, OR, May 26, 2015. 191 pp.
- Falxa, G.A., M.G. Raphael, C. Strong, J. Baldwin, M. Lance, D. Lynch, S.F. Pearson, and R. Young. 2015. Status and trend of marbled murrelet populations in the Northwest Forest Plan area. Chapter 1. in: Falxa, G.A.; Raphael, M.G., technical editors. 2015xx. Northwest Forest Plan—The first 20 years (1994-2013): status and trend of marbled murrelet populations and nesting habitat. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Draft Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-XXXX., Portland, OR, May 26, 2015. 59 pp.
- Gutowsky, S., M.H. Janssen, P. Arcese, T.K. Kyser, D. Ethier, M.B. Wunder, D.F. Bertram, L.M. Tranquilla, C. Lougheed, and D.R. Norris. 2009. Concurrent declines in nesting diet quality and reproductive success of a threatened seabird over 150 years. *Bioscience* 9:247-254.
- Hamer, T.E., and D.J. Meekins. 1999. Marbled murrelet nest site selection in relation to habitat characteristics in Western Washington. Hamer Environmental, Mount Vernon, WA, January 1999. 26 pp.
- Hamer, T.E., and S.K. Nelson. 1995. Characteristics of marbled murrelet nest trees and nesting stands. Pages 69-82 *In* C.J. Ralph, G.L. Hunt, M.G. Raphael, and J.F. Piatt, eds. *Ecology and conservation of the marbled murrelet*, U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, General Technical Report PSW-152, Albany, California.

- Hamer, T.E., S.K. Nelson, and T.J. Mohagen II. 2003. Nesting chronology of the marbled murrelet in North America. Hamer Environmental and Oregon Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, Portland, OR, February 2003. 22 pp.
- Hebert, P.N., and R.T. Golightly. 2006. Movements, nesting, and response to anthropogenic disturbance of marbled murrelets (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*) in Redwood National and State Parks, California. California Department of Fish and Game, 2006-02, Sacramento, California, May, 2006. 321 pp.
- Henry, B., W.B. Tyler, and M.Z. Peery. 2012. Abundance and productivity of marbled murrelets off central California during the 2010 and 2011 breeding seasons. University of California, Santa Cruz, Center for Ocean Health, Santa Cruz, CA, October 2012. 18 pp.
- Henry, B., and B. Tyler. 2014. 2014 at-sea monitoring of marbled murrelets in Central California. UC Santa Cruz, Institute of Marine Science, Santa Cruz, CA, November 13, 2014. 5 pp.
- Huff, M.H., M.G. Raphael, S.L. Miller, S.K. Nelson, and J. Baldwin. 2006. Northwest Forest Plan - The first 10 years (1994-2003): Status and trends of populations and nesting habitat for the marbled murrelet. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, General Technical Report: PNW-GTR-650, Portland, Oregon, June, 2006. 149 pp.
- Jodice, P.G.R., and M.W. Collopy. 1999. Diving and foraging patterns of marbled murrelets (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*): testing predictions from optimal-breathing models. Canadian Journal of Zoology 77(9):1409-1418.
- Lance, M.M., and S.F. Pearson. 2016. Washington 2015 at-sea marbled murrelet population monitoring: Research Progress Report. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Wildlife Science Division., Olympia, Washington, January 2016. 17 pp.
- Littell, J.S., E.E. Oneil, D. McKenzie, J.A. Hicke, J.A. Lutz, R.A. Norheim, and M.M. Elsner. 2010. Forest ecosystems, disturbance, and climatic change in Washington state, USA. Climatic Change 102:129-158.
- Long, L.L., S.L. Miller, C.J. Ralph, and E.A. Elias. 2008. Marbled murrelet abundance, distribution, and productivity along the coasts of Northern California and Southern Oregon, 2005-2007, Report to USFWS and Bureau of Land Management, Arcata, California, 2008. 49 pp.
- Mathews, N.J.C., and A.E. Burger. 1998. Diving depth of a marbled murrelet. Northwestern Naturalist 79(2):70-71.
- McShane, C., T.E. Hamer, H.R. Carter, R.C. Swartzman, V.L. Friesen, D.G. Ainley, K. Nelson, A.E. Burger, L.B. Spear, T. Mohagen, R. Martin, L.A. Henkel, K. Prindle, C. Strong, and J. Keany. 2004. Evaluation reports for the 5-year status review of the marbled murrelet in Washington, Oregon, and California. EDAW, Inc, Seattle, Washington. 370 pp.

- Miller, S.L., M.G. Raphael, G.A. Falxa, C. Strong, J. Baldwin, T. Bloxton, B.M. Galleher, M. Lance, D. Lynch, and S.F. Pearson. 2012. Recent population decline of the marbled murrelet in the Pacific Northwest. *The Condor* 114(4):771-781.
- Mote, P.W., and E.P. Salathe. 2010. Future climate in the Pacific Northwest. *Climatic Change* 102(1-2):29-50.
- Naslund, N.L. 1993. Why do marbled murrelet attend old-growth forest nesting areas year-round? *Auk* 110(3):594-602.
- Nelson, S.K. 1997. The birds of North America, No. 276 - marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*). Pages 1-32 *In* A. Poole, and F. Gill, eds. *The birds of North America: Life histories for the 21st century*, The Academy of Natural Sciences & The American Ornithologists' Union, Philadelphia, PA; Washington, D.C.
- Nelson, S.K., and T.E. Hamer. 1995. Nesting biology and behavior of the marbled murrelet. Pages 57-67 *In* C.J. Ralph, G.L. Hunt, M.G. Raphael, and J.F. Piatt, eds. *Ecology and conservation of the marbled murrelet*. General Technical Report. PSW-GTW-152, Pacific Southwest Experimental Station, U.S. Forest Service, Albany, California.
- Norris, D.R., P. Arcese, D. Preikshot, D.F. Bertram, and T.K. Kyser. 2007. Diet reconstruction and historic population dynamics in a threatened seabird. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 44(4):875-884.
- NWFPEMP. 2016. Marbled murrelet population estimates, 2000-2015. Based on at-sea surveys conducted in Conservation Zones 1-5. Data provided by the Marbled Murrelet Effectiveness Monitoring Program, NWFP. Northwest Forest Plan Marbled Murrelet Effectiveness Monitoring Program, January 25, 2016. 5 pp.
- O'Donnell, B.P., N.L. Naslund, and C.J. Ralph. 1995. Patterns of seasonal variation of activity of marbled murrelets in forest stands. Pages 117-128 *In* C.J. Ralph, G.L. Hunt, M.G. Raphael, and J.F. Piatt, eds. *Ecology and conservation of the marbled murrelet*. General Technical Report. PSW-GTW-152, Pacific Southwest Experimental Station, U.S. Forest Service, Albany, California.
- Øyan, H.S., and T. Anker-Nilssen. 1996. Allocation of growth in food-stressed Atlantic puffin chicks. *The Auk* 113(4):830-841.
- Peery, M.Z., S.R. Beissinger, S.H. Newman, E.B. Burkett, and T.D. Williams. 2004. Applying the declining population paradigm: diagnosing causes of poor reproduction in the marbled murrelet. *Conservation Biology* 18(4):1088-1098.
- Piatt, J.F., and N.L. Naslund. 1995. Chapter 28: Abundance, distribution, and population status of marbled murrelets in Alaska. USDA Forest Service, Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-152. 10 pp.

- Ralph, C.J., G.L. Hunt, M.G. Raphael, and J.F. Piatt. 1995. Ecology and conservation of the marbled murrelet in North America: An overview. Pages 3-22 *In* C.J. Ralph, G.L. Hunt, M.G. Raphael, and J.F. Piatt, eds. Ecology and conservation of the marbled murrelet. General Technical Report. PSW-GTW-152, Pacific Southwest Experimental Station, United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Albany, California.
- Raphael, M.G., A.J. Shirk, G.A. Falxa, D. Lynch, S.F.P. S.K. Nelson, C. Strong, and R.D. Young. 2015a. Factors influencing status and trend of marbled murrelet populations: An integrated perspective. Chapter 3 in: Falxa, G.A.; Raphael, M.G., technical editors. 2015xx. Northwest Forest Plan—The first 20 years (1994-2013): status and trend of marbled murrelet populations and nesting habitat. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Draft PNW-GTR-XXXX, Portland, OR, May 26, 2015. 36 pp.
- Raphael, M.G., G.A. Falxa, K.M. B.M. Galleher, D. Lynch, S.L. Miller, S.K. Nelson, and R.D. Young. 2011. Northwest Forest Plan - the first 15 years (1994-2008): status and trend of nesting habitat for the marbled murrelet. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-848., Portland, OR, August 2011. 52 pp.
- Raphael, M.G., and T.D. Bloxton. 2009. Nesting habitat and nest success of the marbled murrelet in forests around the Olympic Peninsula. *In* Abstracts from the 2009 Joint Annual Meeting of the Society for Northwestern Vertebrate Biology and Washington Chapter of the Wildlife Society, February 18-21, 2009, Northwestern Naturalist, 90:163-188. 3 pp.
- Raphael, M.G., D. Evans-Mack, J.M. Marzluff, and J.M. Luginbuhl. 2002. Effects of forest fragmentation on populations of the marbled murrelet. *Studies in Avian Biology* 25:221-235.
- Raphael, M.G., G.A. Falxa, D. Lynch, S.K. Nelson, S.F. Pearson, A.J. Shirk, and R.D. Young. 2015b. Status and trend of nesting habitat for the marbled murrelet under the Northwest Forest Plan. Chapter 2 in: Falxa, G.A.; Raphael, M.G., technical editors. 2015xx. Northwest Forest Plan—The first 20 years (1994-2013): status and trend of marbled murrelet populations and nesting habitat. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-XXXX. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station., Draft Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-XXXX., Portland, OR., May 26, 2015. 90 pp.
- Raphael, M.G., J.M. Olson, and T. Bloxton. 2007. Summary report of field observation of marbled murrelets in the San Juan Islands, Washington. USDA Forest Service, Pacific NW Research Station, Olympia, Washington. 25 pp.
- Raphael, M.G., A.J. Shirk, G.A. Falxa, and S.F. Pearson. 2015c. Habitat associations of marbled murrelets during the nesting season in nearshore waters along the Washington to California coast. *Journal of Marine Systems* 146:17-25.
- Salathé, E.P., L.R. Leung, Y. Qian, and Y. Zhang. 2010. Regional climate model projections for the State of Washington. *Climatic Change* 102(1-2):51-75.

- Speich, S.M., and T.R. Wahl. 1995. Marbled murrelet populations of Washington -- marine habitat preferences and variability of occurrence. Pages 313-326 *In* C.J. Ralph, G.L. Hunt, M.G. Raphael, and J.F. Piatt, eds. USDA Forest Service Gen. Tech Rep. PSW-152. USDA.
- Strachan, G., M. McAllister, and C.J. Ralph. 1995. Marbled murrelet at-sea and foraging behavior. Pages 247-253 *In* C.J. Ralph, G.L. Hunt, M.G. Raphael, and J.F. Piatt, eds. Ecology and conservation of the marbled murrelet. PSW-GTR-152, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Albany, CA.
- Thoresen, A.C. 1989. Diving times and behavior of pigeon guillemots and marbled murrelets off Rosario Head, Washington. *Western Birds* 20:33-37.
- USFWS. 1997. Recovery Plan for the threatened marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*) in Washington, Oregon, and California. U.S. Department of the Interior, Portland, Oregon, 1997. 203 pp.
- USFWS. 2004. Marbled murrelet 5-year review process: overview, Portland, Oregon. 28 pp.
- USFWS. 2009. Marbled Murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*) 5-Year Review. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Lacey, Washington, June 12, 2009.
- USFWS. 2012a. Marbled Murrelet nesting season and analytical framework for section 7 consultation in Washington. USFWS, Lacey, Washington, June 20, 2012. 8 pp.
- USFWS. 2012b. Report on Marbled Murrelet recovery implementation team meeting and stakeholder workshop. USFWS, Lacey, Washington, April 17, 2012. 66 pp.
- Watanuki, Y., and A.E. Burger. 1999. Body mass and dive durations in alcids and penguins. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 77:1838-1842.
- Westerling, A.L., H.G. Hidalgo, D.R. Cayan, and T.W. Swetnam. 2006. Warming and earlier spring increase western U.S. forest wildfire activity. *Science* 313:940-943.