

Produced by The Institute for Bird Populations' Sierra Nevada Bird Observatory

Black-backed Woodpecker MIS Surveys on Sierra Nevada National Forests: 2013 Annual Report

A report in fulfillment of Forest Service Agreement No. 08-CS-11052005-201, Modification #4.

July 22, 2014

Rodney B. Siegel, Morgan W. Tingley, and Robert L. Wilkerson

The Institute for Bird Populations P.O. Box 1346 Point Reyes Station, CA 94956

www.birdpop.org



Black-backed Woodpecker. Original artwork by Lynn Schofield.

Table of Contents

Summary	1
Introduction	4
Methods	6
Sample Design	6
Data Collection	6
Data Analysis	10
Results	17
Scope of Survey Work Completed	17
Black-backed Woodpecker Detections	17
Analysis of Annual Occupancy	26
Analysis of Dynamic Occupancy	32
Analysis of Multispecies Habitat Relationships	36
Discussion	40
Black-backed Woodpecker Annual Occupancy	40
Black-backed Woodpecker Dynamic Occupancy	41
Multi-species Occupancy within Post-fire Forests	42
Acknowledgments	44
Literature Cited	45
Appendix I: List of all non-aquatic bird species identified during Black-backed Woodpecker	ſ
surveys	49

List of Tables

Table 1. Encounter history frequencies in the 2013 Black-backed Woodpecker survey data 13
Table 2. Summary information for each fire area surveyed once or more during the 2009 – 2013
field seasons of Black-backed Woodpecker MIS monitoring on Sierra Nevada national
forests
Table 3. Summary of Black-backed Woodpecker detections and posterior distributions of both
fire-level and average point-levelpredictions of occupancy probability for all fire areas
surveyed during 2009 - 2013
Table 4. Posterior summaries for intercepts and regression coefficients for single-year
occupancy models as applied to 2009-2013 survey data
Table 5. Top models comparing different combinations of colonization and extinction covariates
for point-level changes in occupancy
Table 6. Cumulative AIC weights in support of individual covariates in compared models for
both colonization and extinction probabilities
Table 7. All bird species with >10 detections across all years of surveys and means and standard
deviations of habitat associations

List of Figures

Figure 1. Schematic diagram of our survey methodology for detecting Black-backed
Woodpeckers
Figure 2. Fire areas on the Modoc and Lassen National Forests that we surveyed for Black-
backed Woodpeckers during the 2013 Black-backed Woodpecker MIS monitoring field
season
Figure 3. Fire areas on the Plumas, Tahoe, and Eldorado National Forests and the Lake Tahoe
Basin Management Unit that we surveyed for Black-backed Woodpeckers during the 2013
Black-backed Woodpecker MIS monitoring field season
Figure 4. Fire areas on the Stanislaus and Sierra National Forests that were surveyed for Black-
backed Woodpeckers during the 2013 Black-backed Woodpecker MIS monitoring field
season24
Figure 5. Fire areas on the Inyo and Sequoia National Forests that were surveyed for Black-
backed Woodpeckers during the 2013 Black-backed Woodpecker MIS monitoring field
season
Figure 6. Mean probability of fire-level (ω) and point-level (ψ) occupancy for Black-backed
Woodpeckers as modeled from individual year-based hierarchical models
Figure 7. Changes in cumulative AIC weights for each of 4 covariate relationships with
colonization and extinction over three consecutive analysis years
Figure 8. Modeled covariate relationships with probability of colonization and extinction 36

Summary

The Black-backed Woodpecker (*Picoides arcticus*) was selected by the Pacific Southwest Region of the USDA Forest Service as a Management Indicator Species (MIS) for snags in burned forests across the ten Sierra Nevada national forest units in the Pacific Southwest Region: Eldorado, Inyo, Lassen, Modoc, Plumas, Sequoia, Sierra, Stanislaus, Tahoe, and the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit. In 2008 The Institute for Bird Populations collaborated with Region 5 personnel to develop and field-tested survey procedures and collected preliminary information on Black-backed Woodpecker distribution across Sierra Nevada national forests. We used the findings from our 2008 pilot study to design a long-term MIS monitoring program for Blackbacked Woodpecker across ten national forest units of the Sierra Nevada, which we have now implemented annually since 2009. The primary goal of the program is to monitor trends in the amount of recently burned forest on the study area's ten national forests that is occupied by Black-backed Woodpeckers, so that Forest Service personnel can evaluate the likely effects of forest plan implementation on Black-backed Woodpecker populations. Additional goals are to better understand Black-backed Woodpecker abundance, distribution, and habitat associations across the Sierra Nevada, to develop information that can inform effective conservation of Black-backed Woodpecker in the Sierra Nevada, and to collect and interpret information on other bird species utilizing burned forests.

During the 2013 field season, we used passive and broadcast surveys to assess Black-backed Woodpecker occupancy at 1008 survey points arrayed across 53 recent fire areas (1-10 years post-fire) throughout our study area. Combined with data collected during 2009 - 2012, we now have broadcast surveys and habitat assessment data at 1756 unique survey points within 94 fire areas. We also collected on-the-ground habitat data at each survey point, and collated additional habitat data from remote-sensed GIS sources. In addition, we conducted passive point counts for other bird species at approximately half of the Black-backed Woodpecker survey points.

In 2013 we detected Black-backed Woodpeckers at 217 survey points distributed across 25 of the 53 fire areas we surveyed, including fire areas on all ten national forest units in our study area.

We detected Black-backed Woodpeckers on both the west and east sides of the Sierra Nevada crest, and across nearly the full latitudinal range of our study area.

Results were produced by three separate analyses, beginning with an exploration of annual changes in Black-backed Woodpecker occurrence within our sampling frame. To assess these changes, we used a hierarchical modeling approach that incorporated separate but linked models for the observation (detection) and state (occupancy) processes. Additionally, the state process was split into two hierarchical levels, to separately model whether a fire (or at least the portion of it we sampled) was occupied (fire-level occupancy) and whether survey points within a fire were occupied (point-level occupancy). For each occupancy probability model, we defined a logit-linear model that included covariates that we deemed important based on previous years' analyses. Fire age was the only fire-level covariate, while point-level covariates included latitude, snag density, burn severity, pre-fire canopy cover, and elevation. Detectability was modeled as a function of survey interval duration (2- vs. 3-minute), count type (passive vs. broadcast survey), and seasonality (day of year). Each survey year was modeled separately, providing independent but comparable models of true occurrence within each year's sampling frame.

Mean occupancy probability for points surveyed in 2013 was 0.18 (95% credible interval: 0.17 - 0.20), which overlaps with estimates for 2010 (mean: 0.19) and 2011 (mean: 0.21) but is lower than estimates for 2013 (mean: 0.24). These results suggest that occupancy dropped in 2013, but to levels seen in previous years.

At this time there is no evidence of a temporal trend in occupancy rates during the five years (2009-2013) we have been monitoring Black-backed Woodpeckers on National Forests in California, or of a broad-scale change in the species' distribution in California. Although the distribution of the species appears to change slightly from year to year, Black-backed Woodpeckers remain present across their historic range in California.

Our second analysis used data from all five survey years (2009-2013) to explore occurrence dynamics over time, specifically the probabilities of colonization and extinction of Black-backed

Woodpeckers at survey points and fires. Our top models of point-level colonization and extinction, as compared using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), strongly indicated that different parameters governed colonization dynamics versus extinction dynamics. The average probability of colonization by Black-backed Woodpeckers at a previously unoccupied point in any given year was modeled to be 6.5%, while the average probability that an occupied site would go extinct in any given year was 72%. The probability of extinction had no clear covariate relationships, with moderate support for negative relationships with increased burn severity – extinction occurred less frequently at survey points with greater burn severity. Colonization, however, had very strong relationships to two covariates. Colonization was more likely at early post-fire points and at points with higher densities of snags. The strong support for fire age as a covariate of colonization but not extinction implies a fundamentally different dynamic governing Black-backed Woodpecker occupancy than previously considered: Black-backed Woodpeckers do not necessarily abandon sites because they are too old, but that old sites are less likely to be colonized by constantly shifting woodpecker populations.

Our third analysis focused on other bird species occupying recently burned forests. In addition to Black-backed Woodpeckers, our passive point counts combined across five years yielded detections of 127 other bird species within the fire areas. Of these species, 62 (48%) have been recorded during surveys over all 5 sampling years, and 38 (30%) have been detected at over 50 surveys, indicating substantial spatial and temporal heterogeneity within our spatio-temporal sampling frame.

This diversity, however, appears to be the result of a wide range of recent "post-fire" conditions resulting in a mosaic of different habitats that benefit species with sometimes very different habitat affinities. Our analysis of mean habitat characteristics of 71 abundant species indicates that post-fire species range widely in their needs, with some species, for example, favoring high burn severity or high snag density, while others favor low burn severity or low snag density. Black-backed Woodpeckers appear to be at one extreme – favoring early post-fire conditions with high snag densities – that may not be representative of preferred post-fire conditions for the majority of other species using these areas.

Introduction

The Black-backed Woodpecker (*Picoides arcticus*) is designated by the Pacific Southwest Region of the USDA Forest Service as a Management Indicator Species (MIS) for snags in burned forests across the ten Sierra Nevada national forest units in the Pacific Southwest Region: Eldorado, Inyo, Lassen, Modoc, Plumas, Sequoia, Sierra, Stanislaus, Tahoe, and the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (USDA Forest Service 2007a, 2007b). The MIS approach identifies species whose population changes are believed to indicate the effects of management activities (USDA Forest Service 2007a). The habitat needs of MIS are to be considered in the establishment of forest plan objectives for important wildlife and fish habitat, and as forest plans are implemented through individual projects, Forest Service managers are to assess their effects on MIS habitat (USDA Forest Service 2007a). Additionally, MIS population monitoring is used to assess the outcomes of forest plan implementation, since it is impossible to monitor the status or population trend of all species (USDA Forest Service 2007a). Population monitoring is thus an integral component of the MIS approach.

Black-backed Woodpeckers are most abundant in stands of recently fire-killed snags (Hutto 1995, Kotliar et al. 2002, Smucker et al. 2005), although the species can be found in unburned forest stands throughout its range. Black-backed Woodpeckers foraging in burned forests feed primarily on wood-boring beetle larvae (Villard and Beninger 1993, Murphy and Lehnhausen 1998, Powell 2000), although some studies have also reported or inferred foraging on bark beetle larvae (Lester 1980, Goggans et al. 1988). Bark beetles and wood-boring beetles share important life-history characteristics (both spend a prolonged portion of their life-cycle as larvae inside dead or dying trees) but also exhibit differences that may be important in their ecological interactions with Black-backed Woodpeckers. Bark beetles are small (generally <6 mm in length), numerous, often able to attack live trees, and generally remain as larvae in bark less than a year before emerging as adults (Powell 2000). In contrast, wood-boring beetles have much larger larvae (up to 50 mm long), are less numerous, and can remain as larvae in dead wood for up to three years (Powell 2000). Additionally, most wood-boring beetles are unable to attack living trees, and concentrate heavily in fire-killed wood, which some genera have been shown to

find by sensing smoke or heat (reviewed in Powell 2000). Black-backed Woodpecker preference for wood-boring beetles could thus either drive or result from the species' proclivity to forage and nest in or near forest stands that have recently burned.

Although Black-backed Woodpecker shows a strong association with burned stands of conifer forest, the species is not closely tied to any particular tree species or forest type. Studies from different parts of its range report preferential foraging on Lodgepole Pine (*Pinus contorta*; Bull et al. 1986, Goggans et al. 1989), spruce (*Picea* sp.; Villard 1994, Murphy and Lehnhausen 1998), White Pine (*Pinus strobus*; Villard and Beninger 1993), and in California, Red Fir (*Abies magnifica*; Raphael and White 1984).

In 2008 The Institute for Bird Populations collaborated with Region personnel to develop and field-test survey procedures and collected preliminary information on Black-backed Woodpecker distribution across Sierra Nevada national forests (Siegel et al. 2008). We used the findings from the 2008 pilot study design a long-term MIS monitoring program for Black-backed Woodpecker across ten national forest units of the Sierra Nevada. The primary goal of the program is to monitor trends in the amount of recently burned forest on the study area's ten national forests that is occupied by Black-backed Woodpecker, so that Forest Service personnel can evaluate the likely effects of forest plan implementation on Black-backed Woodpecker abundance, distribution, and habitat associations across the Sierra Nevada, to develop information that can inform effective conservation of Black-backed Woodpecker in the Sierra Nevada, and to collect information on other bird species utilizing burned forests.

In 2013 we continued Sierra-wide MIS monitoring for Black-backed Woodpeckers. Here we detail the results of this fifth year of MIS monitoring in recently burned forest stands.

Methods

Sample Design

We used the GIS data layer VegBurnSeverity12_2.mdb (available from http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/r5/landmanagement/gis/?cid=STELPRDB5327833), which indicates fire boundaries and fire severity of fires throughout California, to extract data for all fires that occurred between 2003 and 2012 and that included at least 50 ha of conifer forest that burned at mid-severity and/or high-severity on one or more of the ten national forest units in our study area.

We assigned fire areas that met our selection criteria, including fires that were sampled in previous years and fires that were new to the survey, to a random priority order. Our intention was to survey the first 50 fire areas on the list in 2012, but if that proved impossible, we would discard fire areas according the priority order, to avoid biasing the sample.

Data Collection

All data collection procedures remained consistent with protocol utilized during the 2012 field season (Siegel et al. 2014).

Establishing survey points. The fire areas we selected varied in size, from 140 ha (2009 Silver Fire on Plumas NF) to 26,957 ha (2012 Chips Fire on Plumas NF). At the smaller fire areas, a 2-person team could easily saturate the fire area with survey effort in a single morning; however saturating the larger fire areas with survey effort could require weeks of work. We limited survey effort to what could be achieved by a 2-person team in one day, generally surveys at about 20 survey points.

For fires that we had not previously surveyed, we determined where within the fire area to place our survey points by using GIS to randomly select a 'survey target point' somewhere within the perimeter of each fire area, and indicating that point on field maps given to field crews. Crews were instructed to establish their survey points as close to the survey target point as possible, using the following rules:

1 – If trails or roads passed through the fire area, survey points were placed along them, such that the point along the road and trail network that was closest to the survey target point AND lay within low- mid- or high-severity burned conifer forest was included within a contiguous array of survey points, spaced 250 m apart. Survey points that were placed along a road were offset 50 m from the actual road in a randomly selected direction, unless only one side of the road was accessible (due to cliffs, for example) or only one side of a road was burned.

2 – If no trails or roads bisected the fire area, crews established an array of evenly spaced (250 m between points) off-trail survey points, as close to the target survey point as reasonably possible, without compromising safety or requiring additional days of hiking to access.

At the larger fire areas we thus sampled only a fraction of the total land area, but that fraction was randomly selected, within reasonable accommodations for accessibility and safety.

For fire areas that had been surveyed previously, we simply used the same survey points that were established previously by our field crews, using the placement rules described above. On rare occasions where survey points established previously were inaccessible due to changes in the landscape, later-lingering snowpack, etc., substitute points were established as close as possible to the previous points following the previously described rules.

Broadcast surveys. At each survey point we conducted a 6-min broadcast survey to elicit responses from Black-backed Woodpeckers. We used FoxPro ZR2 digital game callers to broadcast electronic recordings of Black-backed Woodpecker vocalizations and drumming. The electronic recording we broadcast was obtained from The Macaulay Library of Natural Sounds, Cornell Laboratory of Ornithology (G.A. Keller, recordist), and included the *scream-rattle-snarl* vocalization, *pik* calls, and territorial drumming.

We began the 6-min broadcast survey (Fig. 1) at each survey point by broadcasting the recording of Black-backed Woodpecker vocalizations and drumming for approximately 30 seconds at a standardized volume, and then quietly listening and watching for Black-backed Woodpeckers until two minutes had elapsed (including the 30-second broadcast period). At two minutes into the survey we again broadcasted the 30-second recording, and then quietly listened and watched until a total of four minutes had elapsed since the beginning of the survey, at which point we repeated the sequence of broadcasting and listening one more time, yielding three 2-min survey intervals. When Black-backed Woodpeckers were detected, we recorded their initial distance and bearing from the observer, whether species identification was confirmed visually, age (adult or juvenile) and sex (male, female, or unknown) of each bird, and whether the individual performed territorial drumming or vocalized. Black-backed Woodpecker surveys generally began within 10 min of official local sunrise, and were always completed by 3.5 h after sunrise.

Passive surveys and multi-species point counts. At 485 of the survey points (generally every second point along each transect), we *preceded* the broadcast survey with a 7-min passive point count to count all birds of any species (including Black-backed Woodpecker). The 7-min point count consisted of a 3-min interval immediately followed by two 2-min intervals (Fig. 1). Division of the count into discrete detection intervals yields information for assessing detection probability of Black-backed Woodpeckers. Observers estimated the horizontal distance, to the nearest meter, to each bird detected. Estimating distance to each bird provides additional information for estimating detection probability in a distance sampling framework (Buckland et al. 2001). The observers also recorded whether each bird ever produced its territorial song during the point count. Additional details of the point count methods are provided in Siegel et al. (2010).





Habitat and other ancillary data. After completing point counts and broadcast surveys each day, observers returned to the survey points to collected cursory habitat data. In addition to recording UTM coordinates, they classified the habitat within a 50-m radius plot centered on the survey point, according to the California Wildlife Habitat Relationships (CWHR) habitat classification system (California Department of Fish and Game 2005). They also characterized the abundance and size of snags within the plot, estimated basal area of snags and live trees using a 10 BAF timber-cruising crutch, recorded the dominant pre-fire habitat type, and used CWHR-defined categories to classify the dominant tree size (including snags) and amount of remaining live canopy cover. Additional details of the methods for collecting habitat data are provided in Siegel et al. (2010).

Data Analysis

Goals and analysis structure. Based on previous analyses of the MIS data (Siegel et al. 2014), our analytical goals for the 2013 data centered on formalizing analyses begun in 2011 to capitalize on the extended time-series of monitoring data. Specifically, our analysis focuses on answering three questions:

(1) What is the overall proportion of fires and points in the sampling frame occupied in 2013 and how does this compare to previous years?

(2) What are the probabilities of colonization and extinction at sites, and how have they changed over time and with site-specific environmental factors?

(3) What can we learn about overall bird community composition and structure at recently burned sites?

Question 1 builds extensively on previous work, provides a model for future annual assessments, and is the central question that this monitoring program was implemented to answer. Question 2 allows a greater understanding of the dynamics underlying changes in Black-backed Woodpecker occurrence. Goal 3 builds upon previous analyses (Siegel et al. 2011, 2012, 2014) to further explore post-fire bird communities and their habitat relationships. Descriptions of the methods used in addressing each of these questions follow this section.

Based on previous modeling work with the 2009-2012 MIS monitoring data, we examined the relationship between occupancy and occupancy dynamics with the following environmental and site characteristics:

- Latitude (in decimal degrees) recorded from USGS topographic maps.
- Elevation, collected in the field from GPS and USGS topographic maps but formalized from intersecting GPS points with a 30-m resolution California DEM (Gesch 2007, Gesch et al. 2002). In models we used the residuals of a regression of elevation on latitude, thereby

controlling for the downslope bias in elevational ranges as latitude increases (Saracco et al. 2011, Siegel et al. 2011).

- Density of snags (standing dead trees) recorded at the survey point. Snag counts were conducted immediately after completing woodpecker surveys at burned sites and consisted of counting all snags of different size classes (10-30, 30-60, and >60 cm dbh) within 50 m of each survey point. Size-specific snag counts were aggregated in the field into different categories (≤5, 6-15, 16-30, 31-50, 51-100, >100), which were converted to numerical quantities (1, 6, 16, 31, 51, 101, respectively) for analysis. Counts across all three size classes were summed and snag density (snags/ha) was calculated.
- Density of live trees recorded at the survey point. Live tree density was calculated from vegetation survey data using the same methods as snag density.
- Pre-fire % tree cover calculated from 100-m resolution California Multi-source Land Cover Data (http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/data/frapgisdata/download.asp?spatialdist=1&rec=fveg02_2). We calculated this variable by averaging midpoints of the % tree cover variable (WHRDENSITY) at 100 m buffers around survey points.
- Number of years since fire (range = 1 to 10 years).
- Change in percent canopy cover (a measure of burn severity) based on satellite derived relativized difference normalized burn ratio score RdNBR (Miller et al. 2009). Values of *cc* were summarized at 90-m² resolution by averaging 30-m² values from GIS layers provided by the US Forest Service (J. D. Miller) using the 'raster' package in R (Hijmans and Etten 2012).

Modeling annual occupancy. Occupancy models allow the estimation of the true presence (or occupancy) of a species at a location, unbiased by false absences. As survey data inherently contain an unknown quantity of false absences (i.e., non-detections when the species was truly present), it is critical that survey data be interpreted only after accounting for false absences. The framework presented here builds on the framework developed in the 2011 MIS report (Siegel et al. 2012) and published by Saracco et al. (2011). As presented in prior reports (Siegel et al. 2012, 2014), given 3 (or more) years of sampling, combining all data into one model is not advantageous due to pseudoreplication of treating yearly surveys at the same sites as independent occurrence samples. A dynamic occupancy modeling framework (MacKenzie et al. 2003) allows

the annual modeling of occupancy within one model, and avoids pseudoreplication, but that framework prioritizes the modeling of colonization and extinction probabilities, leaving annual occupancy solely as a derived parameter. When occupancy is a derived parameter, one cannot explicitly model relationships between it and other factors, such as environmental covariates. Thus, we prefer not to use dynamic occupancy models for direct inference on annual changes in occupancy. While we present a dynamic occupancy analysis here (see *Modeling dynamic occupancy*), for consistency in occurrence estimates across yearly reports, we also present results of single-year occupancy models for each of the five years of monitoring that have now been completed. The drawback of using multiple single-year occupancy models is that covariate relationships will be modeled independently for each year, yielding different occupancy estimates than if all years were pooled into a single model. However, combined with modeling of occupancy dynamics, we believe this to be a strong framework for the analysis of trends over time.

Our annual model of occupancy was based from data on i = 1,...,N survey points, j = 1,...,M fire areas, and k = 1,...,K survey intervals, with values for *N*, *M*, and *K*, unique to survey year. For the five years of monitoring, these values were: 899, 860, 895, 953, and 1008 for *N* points in 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013 respectively; 51, 49, 50, 52, and 53 for *M* fire areas; and 5, 9, 6, 6, and 6 for *K* survey intervals (combined passive surveys with 3 broadcast surveys).

The observational data for our model consisted of encounter histories for each survey point. In 2009, our field protocol consisted of what might be called a 'double' removal design (Farnsworth et al. 2002), such that only the first interval of encounter was recorded for the passive count intervals, and the count was discontinued following a detection on the broadcast count intervals. In 2010 - 2013, a full detection history recording all detections or non-detections was recorded for all passive survey intervals, while the removal design (i.e., discontinuing counts following the initial broadcast-based detection) was used for broadcast intervals. This sampling framework resulted in 32 possible detection histories for 2013, the results of which are summarized in Table 1. Tables of encounter histories for previous years can be found in previous annual reports (Siegel et al. 2010, 2011, 2012, 2014).

Table 1. Encounter history frequencies (numbers of survey points) in the 2013 Black-backed Woodpecker survey data. For passive surveys, the total number of survey intervals that one or more Black-backed Woodpeckers were detected in is listed (passive surveys were only conducted at approximately half of points). For broadcast survey capture histories, ones indicate detections, zeros indicate non-detections, and NAs indicate missing data (by design, see text for detail). Overall, Black-backed Woodpeckers were detected at 165 of the 1008 points that we surveyed in 2013.

Number of pagaine detections	В	Engguarau		
Number of passive detections	Interval 1	Interval 2	Interval 3	- rrequency
	0	0	0	440
-	0	0	1	12
-	0	1	NA	22
-	1	NA	NA	49
0	0	0	0	403
0	0	0	1	10
0	0	1	NA	14
0	1	NA	NA	27
1	0	0	0	2
1	0	0	1	0
1	0	1	NA	2
1	1	NA	NA	10
2	0	0	0	3
2	0	0	1	0
2	0	1	NA	3
2	1	NA	NA	1
3	0	0	0	1
3	0	0	1	0
3	0	1	NA	2
3	1	NA	NA	7

To model annual occupancy, we used a hierarchical modeling framework (Royle and Dorazio 2008) to build separate but linked models for the observation (detection) and state (occupancy) processes. Our occupancy model structure identically followed that described in the 2011 analysis (Siegel et al. 2012). This structure subdivides the state (i.e., true occurrence) observation into two hierarchical levels separating the processes that determine whether a fire is occupied (more accurately, the portion of a fire surveyed by all points), and the processes that determine whether a point is occupied. This separation of fire-level and point-level occupancy processes better describe the heterogeneity of the system and the observed dynamics of woodpecker occupancy.

For each year of data, the same set of covariates was used for the modeling of occupancy (both fire-level and point-level) and detectability. Detectability was modeled as a function of survey interval duration (3-minute or 2-minute), survey type (passive or broadcast), and day of year. Fire-level occupancy was modeled as a function of fire age but was also allowed a random fire-level effect (Saracco et al. 2011). Point-level occupancy was modeled as a function of latitude, elevation, snag density, pre-fire canopy cover, and burn severity (see *Goals and analysis structure*, above).

We implemented a Bayesian analysis of the model using Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods (Gilks et al. 1996) in the software package JAGS (Plummer 2003). We used vague prior distributions for all model parameters. For all covariate effects in the model we used Norm(0, 0.001) priors. We assigned a prior of Norm(0, $1/\sigma_i^2$) for the random point effect (fire_j) in the model for ω_j , and a prior of Unif(0,10) for the variance parameter σ_f . For the intercepts of the *p* and ψ models, we defined priors for inverse-logit transformed parameters using Unif(0, 1). We conducted the JAGS analysis from R (R Development Core Team 2012) using the R2jags package (Su and Yajima 2014). Further details of model structure and parameterization, are provided in our previous analyses (Siegel et al. 2011, 2012, 2014).

Modeling point-level dynamic occupancy. Detectability, initial occupancy, colonization and extinction of Black-backed Woodpeckers at survey points over time were modeled using a dynamic occupancy framework (MacKenzie et al. 2003). In this framework, initial occupancy (ψ_0) is modeled for all survey points in the first year of sampling, and then the occurrence status is allowed to change between years according to an estimated probability of colonization (γ) or extinction (ε) . Thus, the probability of occupancy at time *t* is dependent on both the initial occupancy probability as well as the probability (combined γ and ε) that the point has transitioned states from time 0 to time *t*.

In this framework, ψ has a slightly different interpretation from the previous analysis (*Modeling annual occupancy*). First, as the focus was on colonization and extinction dynamics, occupancy was modeled only at the point level (i.e., no fire-level occupancy) and occurrence at neighboring

points within the same fire were assumed to be independent (i.e., no random effect of fire). Second, in a dynamic framework, average occupancy for year t is based upon the total number of points that are surveyed across all years, not the total number of points that were actually surveyed in year t. In other words, the dynamic framework estimates occupancy in any year across all 1756 survey points, not the ~850-1000 that were actually visited in any given survey season. As occupancy estimates are always proportions, the occupancy estimates derived from the two analyses will always be different due to different denominators within the occupancy proportions. Thus, care needs be taken when comparing occupancy estimates derived from the two analyses.

Dynamic occupancy modeling was conducted in a likelihood-based framework, whereby different competing models were built and their relative strength was measured using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC; Burnham and Anderson 2002). In this model selection framework, competing models are built using all possible combinations of *a priori* selected variables. Since four variables can be parameterized (p, ψ_0 , χ and ε), this can lead to an untenable number of competing models. Thus, we used a two-step process, through which the best parameterization for p and ψ_0 was determined by AIC, and then that single parameterization was used for all competing models of γ and ε . Similar to the previous analysis, for detectability we investigated the effect of elevation (including quadratic effects) and latitude. Combined, these factors resulted in 56 competing models which were combined with null (i.e., random) model parameterizations for colonization and extinction. All 56 models were run and the best supported model was selected as the one with the lowest AIC.

Following selection of the best supported parameterization for detectability and initial occupancy, this parameterization was used to compare differently parameterized models of colonization and extinction. We tested the effects of snag density, fire age, burn severity, and pre-fire canopy cover as potential covariates for both colonization and extinction. Including models with multiple covariates, this resulted in 256 uniquely parameterized competing models, each with the same initial occupancy and detectability covariates, but with different colonization

and extinction covariates. Support within the data for each model was determined through comparisons of AIC.

All models were run in R version 2.15 (R Core Team 2014) using the package 'unmarked' (Fiske and Chandler 2011).

Community habitat relationships. Building on the analysis of multi-species point count data from past years (e.g., Siegel et al. 2012), we sought to further explore how burned forest communities change in the 10 years post-fire and what bird species are strongly associated with different elements of burned forest habitat. We focused our inference on species' associations with five different descriptors of post-fire habitat at each survey point: fire age, snag basal area, live tree basal area, percent of the sampling area covered by shrubs, and fire severity (see *Goals and analysis structure*). We calculated the mean and standard error for the set of sites at which each species was detected. We acknowledge that some species may have occurred at sites and gone undetected which can bias perceptions of habitat associations. To examine whether species' relationships to habitat variables may be important, point-level detections were analyzed for each species with a binomially distributed Generalized Linear Mixed Model (GLMM). Fixed effects for each species were the five habitat variables, and fire was used as a random effect. Variables with Wald scores of *p* < 0.05 were considered significant. For all parts of the community-level analysis, species with less than 10 detections across all years of surveying were not analyzed.

Results

Scope of Survey Work Completed

In 2013 we completed surveys fully to protocol at 53 fire areas (Table 2), including broadcast surveys and habitat assessments at 1008 survey points and passive, multi-species point counts at 485 of those points. All surveys were conducted between 9 May and 1 July, 2013 and surveyed fires encompassed nearly the full latitudinal range of the ten National Forests (the most northerly fires surveyed, Barry Point and Fletcher, span the California-Oregon border and the most southerly fire surveyed, Piute 08, burned in the Piute Mountains near the southern extreme of Sequoia National Forest). Combined with data collected during 2009-2012 we now have broadcast surveys and habitat assessment data at 1756 unique survey points within 94 fire areas. We provide summary information about fire areas surveyed once or more between 2009 and 2013 in Table 2.

Black-backed Woodpecker Detections

In 2013 we detected Black-backed Woodpeckers at 217 survey points distributed across 25 of the 53 fire areas we surveyed (Figs. 2-4). We detected Black-backed Woodpeckers at one or more fires on all ten National Forest units in our study area. As was the case in previous years, we detected Black-backed Woodpeckers on both the west and east sides of the Sierra crest, and across nearly the full latitudinal range of our study area, including the second-most northerly fire area we surveyed (the Barry Point fire area on the Modoc NF, which spans the California – Oregon border; Fig. 2), and the fourth-most southerly fire area we surveyed (the Granite fire area on the Sequoia NF; Fig. 5). We provide UTM coordinates and survey history of all survey points on an interactive, online map at:

http://www.birdpop.net/index.php/viewmaps?catid=2&id=10:bbwomap.

Primary national forest	Fire name	Year of fire	Burned area $(ha)^1$	Dominant pre-fire habitat ²	No. points (2009)	No. points (2010)	No. points (2011)	No. points (2012)	No. points (2013)
Eldorado	Freds	2004	1814	Sierra Mixed Conifer	20	0	19	20	20
Eldorado	Plum	2002	417	Sierra Mixed Conifer	12	12	12	13	0
Eldorado	Power	2004	5538	Sierra Mixed Conifer	20	20	20	20	20
Eldorado	Star	2001	4979	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	20	20	0	0
Inyo	Azusa	2000	164	Pinyon-Juniper	8	0	0	0	0
Inyo	Birch	2002	1117	Pinyon-Juniper	19	0	0	0	0
Inyo	Crater	2001	1118	Jeffrey Pine	20	20	20	0	0
Inyo	Dexter	2003	1022	Jeffrey Pine	16	16	0	16	16
Inyo	Inyo Complex	2007	7574	Ponderosa Pine	16	0	0	0	0
Inyo	McLaughlin	2001	939	Jeffrey Pine	0	13	13	0	0
Inyo	Sawmill 00	2000	144	Ponderosa Pine	5	0	0	0	0
Inyo	Sawmill 06	2006	2452	Pinyon-Juniper	0	0	19	0	20
Inyo	Sherwin	2008	146	Eastside Pine	0	0	0	0	13
Inyo	Summit	2003	2474	Jeffrey Pine	0	0	16	0	16
Lassen	Brown	2009	684	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	20	20	20	19
Lassen	Cone	2002	703	Jeffrey Pine	21	0	21	0	0
Lassen	Corral	2008	1952	Eastside Pine	0	0	0	20	20
Lassen	Cub	2008	6093	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	20	20	15	20
Lassen	Onion 2	2008	1067	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	20	20	20	20
Lassen	Peterson Complex	2008	1161	Eastside Pine	20	20	20	20	20
Lassen	Reading	2012	4504	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	0	0	0	20
Lassen	Straylor	2004	996	Eastside Pine	0	0	0	20	20
Lassen	Sugar Loaf	2009	3127	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	21	21	21	21
Modoc	Barry Point	2012	6740	Eastside Pine	0	0	0	0	20
Modoc	Bell	2001	1260	Juniper	20	20	20	0	0
Modoc	Bell West	1999	773	Eastside Pine	21	0	0	0	0

Table 2. Summary information for each fire area surveyed once or more during the 2009 – 2013 field seasons of Black-backed Woodpecker MIS monitoring on Sierra Nevada national forests.

Primary national		Year of	Burned		No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
forest	Fire name	fire	area $(ha)^1$	Dominant pre-fire habitat ²	(2009)	(2010)	(2011)	(2012)	(2013)
Modoc	Blue	2001	13329	Eastside Pine	20	20	20	0	0
Modoc	Cougar	2011	749	Ponderosa Pine	0	0	0	20	0
Modoc	Fletcher	2007	916	Eastside Pine	19	17	19	20	20
Modoc	High	2006	421	Eastside Pine	0	19	19	19	0
Plumas	Antelope Complex	2007	9297	Sierra Mixed Conifer	21	21	21	21	21
Plumas	Belden	2008	224	Mixed Hardwood-Conifer	0	13	13	13	13
Plumas	Boulder Complex	2006	1475	Eastside Pine	20	20	0	0	20
Plumas	Bucks	1999	11325	Sierra Mixed Conifer	20	0	0	0	0
Plumas	Chips	2012	26957	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	0	0	0	20
Plumas	Cold	2008	2327	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	0	0	19	19
Plumas	Devils Gap	1999	612	Sierra Mixed Conifer	20	0	0	0	0
Plumas	Fox	2008	1007	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	0	18	0	20
Plumas	Frey	2008	4406	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	20	18	0	20
Plumas	Grease	2006	163	Eastside Pine	0	0	0	17	17
Plumas	Horton 2	1999	1637	Sierra Mixed Conifer	20	0	0	0	0
Plumas	Lookout	1999	1009	Sierra Mixed Conifer	21	0	0	0	0
Plumas	Moonlight	2007	18864	Eastside Pine	20	20	20	20	0
Plumas	Pidgen	1999	1859	Sierra Mixed Conifer	18	0	0	0	0
Plumas	Pit	2008	9142	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	0	0	20	20
Plumas	Rich	2008	2360	Sierra Mixed Conifer	21	21	0	21	0
Plumas	Scotch	2008	5647	Sierra Mixed Conifer	21	21	0	21	20
Plumas	Silver	2009	140	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	0	11	11	11
Plumas	Storrie	2000	21117	Red Fir	15	0	0	0	0
Plumas	Stream	2001	1507	Eastside Pine	20	20	15	0	0
Sequoia	Albanita	2003	958	Jeffrey Pine	21	21	21	21	21
Sequoia	Broder Beck	2006	1457	Jeffrey Pine	0	20	20	20	20
Sequoia	Clover	2008	6088	Jeffrey Pine	0	20	20	20	0
Sequoia	Comb	2005	480	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	0	0	20	20

Primary national		Year of	Burned		No. points	No. points	No. points	No.	No. points
forest	Fire name	fire	area $(ha)^1$	Dominant pre-fire habitat ²	(2009)	(2010)	(2011)	(2012)	(2013)
Sequoia	Cooney	2003	841	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	0	0	20	20
Sequoia	Crag 04	2004	364	Jeffrey Pine	19	0	18	19	19
Sequoia	Crag 05	2005	611	Jeffrey Pine	21	20	21	21	21
Sequoia	Deep	2004	1305	Sierra Mixed Conifer	11	11	11	11	11
Sequoia	George	2012	720	Jeffrey Pine	0	0	0	0	20
Sequoia	granite	2009	607	Jeffrey Pine	0	20	20	0	20
Sequoia	Highway	2001	1384	Mixed Hardwood-Conifer	0	0	20	0	0
Sequoia	Hooker	2003	1004	Jeffrey Pine	20	16	20	20	0
Sequoia	Lion	2009	1075	Lodgepole Pine	0	20	20	20	20
Sequoia	Lion 11	2011	7993	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	0	0	20	0
Sequoia	Manter	2000	22450	Pinyon-Juniper	21	20	0	0	0
Sequoia	McNally	2002	61261	Sierra Mixed Conifer	19	17	16	17	0
Sequoia	Piute 08	2008	13516	Jeffrey Pine	20	19	0	0	20
Sequoia	Sheep	2010	2428	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	0	0	20	20
Sequoia	Shotgun	2009	403	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	0	0	16	0
Sequoia	Tamarack	2006	1911	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	0	0	20	20
Sequoia	Vista	2007	180	Jeffrey Pine	19	19	19	19	0
Sierra	Bear	2012	397	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	0	0	0	20
Sierra	Motor	2011	2038	Blue Oak - Foothill Pine	0	0	0	24	0
Sierra	North Fork	2001	1614	Sierra Mixed Conifer	20	13	8	0	0
Sierra	Oliver	2008	1099	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	0	17	0	15
Sierra	Tehipite	2008	3112	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	0	0	21	21
Stanislaus	Hiram	1999	1144	Jeffrey Pine	10	0	0	0	0
Stanislaus	Kibbie	2003	1501	Sierra Mixed Conifer	21	0	21	21	21
Stanislaus	Knight	2009	2140	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	19	19	19	19
Stanislaus	Mountain	2003	1747	Red Fir	0	12	12	9	0
Stanislaus	Mud	2003	1803	Red Fir	21	20	21	21	21
Stanislaus	Ramsey	2012	476	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	0	0	0	20

Primary					No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
national		Year of	Burned		points	points	points	points	points
forest	Fire name	fire	area $(ha)^1$	Dominant pre-fire habitat ²	(2009)	(2010)	(2011)	(2012)	(2013)
Stanislaus	Whit	2003	438	Sierra Mixed Conifer	20	0	20	19	19
Stanislaus	White	2001	107	Sierra Mixed Conifer	8	8	8	0	0
Tahoe	Bassetts	2006	1006	Sierra Mixed Conifer	18	18	0	19	17
Tahoe	Fall	2008	584	Sierra Mixed Conifer	10	10	10	10	19
Tahoe	Gap	2001	574	Sierra Mixed Conifer	0	20	19	0	0
Tahoe	Government	2008	7784	Sierra Mixed Conifer	19	19	19	0	19
Tahoe	Harding	2005	616	Eastside Pine	21	21	21	20	20
Tahoe	Peavine	2008	192	Sierra Mixed Conifer	16	0	0	0	0
Tahoe	Treasure	2001	143	Eastside Pine	10	10	0	0	0
Tahoe Basin	Angora	2007	1146	Sierra Mixed Conifer	19	12	19	19	19
Tahoe Basin	Gondola	2002	165	Red Fir	12	12	0	12	0
Tahoe Basin	Showers	2002	125	Sierra Mixed Conifer	9	9	0	8	0

¹Burned area represents only the total area of the fire within National Forest boundaries.

²Habitat classifications follow California Habitat Relationships (CWHR; California Department of Fish and Game 2005), and indicate the primary pre-fire habitat at the greatest number of survey points in a particular fire area, based on our own on-the-ground assessments.



Figure 2. Fire areas (red shading) on the Modoc and Lassen National Forests that we surveyed for Blackbacked Woodpeckers during the 2013 Black-backed Woodpecker MIS monitoring field season. Names of fire areas where Black-backed Woodpeckers were detected are enclosed in red boxes. Fire area names without red boxes indicate that no Black-backed Woodpeckers were detected; note that lack of detection does not necessarily mean Black-backed Woodpeckers were absent (see text for discussion of detection probability during this survey).



Figure 3. Fire areas (red shading) on the Plumas, Tahoe, and Eldorado National Forests and the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit that we surveyed for Black-backed Woodpeckers during the 2013 Black-backed Woodpecker MIS monitoring field season. Names of fire areas where Black-backed Woodpeckers were detected are enclosed in red boxes. Fire area names without red boxes indicate that no Black-backed Woodpeckers were detected; note that lack of detection does not necessarily mean Black-backed Woodpeckers were absent (see text for discussion of detection probability during this survey).



Figure 4. Fire areas (red shading) on the Stanislaus and Sierra National Forests that were surveyed for Black-backed Woodpeckers during the 2013 Black-backed Woodpecker MIS monitoring field season. Names of fire areas where Black-backed Woodpeckers were detected are enclosed in red boxes. Fire area names without red boxes indicate that no Black-backed Woodpeckers were detected; note that lack of detection does not necessarily mean Black-backed Woodpeckers were absent (see text discussion of detection probability during this survey).



Figure 5. Fire areas (red shading) on the Inyo and Sequoia National Forests that were surveyed for Black-backed Woodpeckers during the 2013 Black-backed Woodpecker MIS monitoring field season. Names of fire areas where Black-backed Woodpeckers were detected are enclosed in red boxes. Fire area names without red boxes indicate that no Black-backed Woodpeckers were detected; note that lack of detection does not necessarily mean Black-backed Woodpeckers were absent (see text discussion of detection probability during this survey).

Analysis of Annual Occupancy

Mean occupancy probability for points surveyed during 2012 was 0.181 (95% credible interval: 0.17 - 0.20), which overlaps with our estimate for 2010 (95% CI: 0.17 - 0.21) and 2011 (95% CI: 0.18 - 0.24) but is significantly less than estimates for 2009 (95% CI: 0.22 - 0.31) and 2012 (95% CI: 0.23 - 0.26) (Figure 6). Table 3 summarizes detections and predicted occupancy probabilities for each fire area surveyed in 2009 through 2013.



Figure 6. Mean probability of fire-level (ω) and point-level (ψ) occupancy for Black-backed Woodpeckers as modeled from individual year-based hierarchical models. Plots show median (bold line), 95% quantiles (box) and full range (whiskers) of posterior distribution of modeled parameters.

Fire name	2009 Detects. (# stns)	2010 Detects. (# stns)	2011 Detects. (# stns)	2012 Detects. (# stns)	2013 Detects. (# stns)	ω_{2009}	ω_{2010}	ω_{2011}	ω_{2012}	ω_{2013}	ψ_{2009}	\u03c6	\u03cm 2011	\u03c6	\U014
Albanita	21 (1)	21 (0)	21 (0)	21 (6)	21 (0)	0.84	0.12	0.13	0.84	0.04	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.30	0.00
Angora	19 (13)	12 (7)	19 (13)	19 (13)	19 (13)	0.90	0.89	0.87	0.86	0.83	0.78	0.61	0.73	0.70	0.71
Antelope Complex	21 (9)	21 (2)	21 (6)	21 (8)	21 (4)	0.90	0.89	0.86	0.86	0.83	0.62	0.23	0.41	0.42	0.26
Azusa	8 (0)	_	_	_	-	0.12	-	-	-	-	0.00	-	-	-	-
Barry Point	-	-	-	-	20 (17)	-	-	-	-	0.96	-	-	-	-	0.86
Bassetts	18 (7)	18 (7)	-	19 (5)	17 (2)	0.89	0.88	-	0.85	0.79	0.48	0.44	-	0.30	0.16
Bear	-	-	-	-	20 (15)	-	-	-	-	0.96	-	-	-	-	0.78
Belden	-	13 (0)	13 (0)	13 (0)	13 (0)	-	0.61	0.18	0.28	0.49	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bell	20 (0)	20 (0)	20 (0)	-	-	0.11	0.10	0.11	-	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-
Bell West	21 (1)	-	-	-	-	0.77	-	-	-	-	0.15	-	-	-	-
Birch	19 (0)	-	-	-	-	0.13	-	-	-	-	0.00	-	-	-	-
Blue	20 (5)	20 (5)	20 (5)	-	-	0.81	0.78	0.79	-	-	0.59	0.32	0.34	-	-
Boulder Complex	20 (9)	20 (1)	-	-	20 (1)	0.88	0.88	-	-	0.79	0.54	0.09	-	-	0.09
Broder Beck	-	20 (7)	20 (0)	20 (2)	20 (3)	-	0.87	0.16	0.85	0.80	-	0.41	0.00	0.12	0.21
Brown	-	20 (7)	20 (14)	20 (10)	19 (2)	-	0.92	0.88	0.86	0.90	-	0.37	0.75	0.52	0.12
Bucks	20 (0)	-	-	-	-	0.09	-	-	-	-	0.00	-	-	-	-
Chips	-	-	-	-	20 (1)	-	-	-	-	0.96	-	-	-	-	0.07
Clover	-	20 (7)	20 (0)	20 (1)	-	-	0.91	0.19	0.86	-	-	0.42	0.00	0.08	-
Cold	-	-	-	19 (11)	19 (11)	-	-	-	0.86	0.87	-	-	-	0.62	0.61
Comb	-	-	-	20 (0)	20 (0)	-	-	-	0.21	0.09	-	-	-	0.00	0.00
Cone	21 (5)	-	21 (6)	-	-	0.82	-	0.81	-	-	0.47	-	0.36	-	-
Cooney	-	-	-	20 (1)	20 (0)	-	-	-	0.84	0.04	-	-	-	0.07	0.00
Corral	-	-	-	20 (10)	20 (7)	-	-	-	0.86	0.87	-	-	-	0.56	0.42
Cougar	-	-	-	20 (13)	-	-	-	-	0.86	-	-	-	-	0.68	-
Crag 04	19 (4)	-	18 (0)	19 (1)	19 (0)	0.86	-	0.14	0.85	0.06	0.29	-	0.00	0.07	0.00
Crag 05	21 (0)	20 (0)	21 (0)	21 (0)	21 (0)	0.19	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Crater	20 (8)	20 (3)	20(7)	-	-	0.81	0.77	0.79	-	-	0.48	0.20	0.39	-	-

Table 3. Summary of Black-backed Woodpecker detections and posterior distributions of both fire-level () and average point-level () predictions of occupancy probability for all fire areas surveyed during 2009 - 2013.

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013										
Fire name	Detects.	Detects.	Detects.	Detects.	Detects.	ω_{2009}	ω_{2010}	ω_{2011}	ω_{2012}	ω_{2013}	ψ_{2009}	ψ_{2010}	ψ_{2011}	ψ_{2012}	ψ_{2013}
	(# stns)														
Cub	-	20 (3)	20 (3)	15 (1)	20 (5)	-	0.91	0.88	0.86	0.86	-	0.17	0.25	0.11	0.27
Deep	11 (0)	11 (0)	11 (0)	11 (0)	11 (0)	0.49	0.30	0.15	0.40	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Devils Gap	20 (0)	-	-	-	-	0.09	-	-	-	-	0.00	-	-	-	-
Dexter	16 (6)	16 (1)	-	16 (7)	16 (0)	0.84	0.82	-	0.85	0.04	0.53	0.19	-	0.47	0.00
Fall	10 (0)	10(1)	10 (0)	10(1)	19 (4)	0.42	0.91	0.19	0.86	0.86	0.02	0.16	0.00	0.14	0.23
Fletcher	19 (15)	17 (5)	19 (8)	20 (10)	20 (0)	0.90	0.90	0.86	0.86	0.14	0.90	0.40	0.53	0.56	0.00
Fox	-	-	18 (0)	-	20 (0)	-	-	0.18	-	0.45	-	-	0.00	-	0.00
Freds	20 (0)	-	19 (0)	20 (0)	20 (0)	0.17	-	0.14	0.14	0.06	0.00	-	0.00	0.00	0.00
Frey	-	20 (0)	18 (0)	-	20 (0)	-	0.49	0.18	-	0.38	-	0.00	0.00	-	0.00
Gap	-	20 (0)	19 (0)	-	-	-	0.10	0.11	-	-	-	0.00	0.00	-	-
George	-	-	-	-	20 (2)	-	-	-	-	0.96	-	-	-	-	0.11
Gondola	12 (6)	12 (4)	-	12 (2)	-	0.83	0.80	-	0.84	-	0.74	0.43	-	0.25	-
Government	19 (1)	19 (3)	19 (4)	-	19 (6)	0.91	0.91	0.88	-	0.87	0.10	0.20	0.31	-	0.34
granite	-	20 (6)	20 (10)	-	20 (10)	-	0.92	0.88	-	0.90	-	0.37	0.53	-	0.54
Grease	-	-	-	17 (0)	17 (0)	-	-	-	0.15	0.11	-	-	-	0.00	0.00
Harding	21 (7)	21 (2)	21 (0)	20 (0)	20 (0)	0.87	0.86	0.14	0.14	0.09	0.41	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.00
High	-	19 (1)	19 (5)	19 (11)	-	-	0.87	0.86	0.85	-	-	0.07	0.36	0.60	-
Highway	-	-	20 (0)	-	-	-	-	0.11	-	-	-	-	0.00	-	-
Hiram	10 (0)	-	-	-	-	0.10	-	-	-	-	0.00	-	-	-	-
Hooker	20 (0)	16 (0)	20 (0)	20 (0)	-	0.14	0.12	0.13	0.14	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-
Horton 2	20 (7)	-	-	-	-	0.77	-	-	-	-	0.51	-	-	-	-
Inyo Complex	16 (0)	-	-	-	-	0.26	-	-	-	-	0.00	-	-	-	-
Kibbie	21 (6)	-	21 (3)	21 (5)	21 (0)	0.85	-	0.81	0.84	0.05	0.33	-	0.21	0.27	0.00
Knight	-	19 (0)	19 (0)	19 (0)	19 (0)	-	0.61	0.20	0.24	0.44	-	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lion	-	20 (7)	20 (2)	20 (6)	20 (7)	-	0.92	0.88	0.87	0.90	-	0.41	0.15	0.32	0.39
Lion 11	-	-	-	20 (4)	-	-	-	-	0.87	-	-	-	-	0.21	-
Lookout	21 (0)	-	-	-	-	0.10	-	-	-	-	0.00	-	-	-	-
Manter	21 (0)	20 (0)	-	-	-	0.14	0.08	-	-	-	0.00	0.00	-	-	-
Mclaughlin	-	13 (0)	13 (1)	-	-	-	0.10	0.79	-	-	-	0.00	0.13	-	-

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013										
Fire name	Detects. (# stns)	ω_{2009}	ω_{2010}	ω_{2011}	ω_{2012}	ω_{2013}	ψ_{2009}	ψ_{2010}	\u03c6	\u03c6	ψ_{2013}				
McNally	19 (0)	17 (0)	16 (0)	17 (0)	-	0.35	0.23	0.12	0.37	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-
Moonlight	20 (11)	20 (5)	20 (11)	20 (11)	-	0.90	0.90	0.86	0.86	-	0.61	0.28	0.61	0.58	-
Motor	-	-	-	24 (0)	-	-	-	-	0.39	-	-	-	-	0.00	-
Mountain	-	12 (1)	12 (3)	9 (4)	-	-	0.82	0.82	0.84	-	-	0.21	0.32	0.46	-
Mud	21 (10)	20 (12)	21 (8)	21 (8)	21 (9)	0.85	0.81	0.82	0.85	0.68	0.54	0.65	0.44	0.42	0.47
North Fork	20 (0)	13 (0)	8 (0)	-	-	0.25	0.17	0.12	-	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-
Oliver	-	-	17 (6)	-	15 (0)	-	-	0.87	-	0.44	-	-	0.43	-	0.00
Onion 2	-	20 (0)	20 (0)	20(1)	20 (0)	-	0.30	0.18	0.86	0.23	-	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.00
Peavine	16 (0)	-	-	-	-	0.54	-	-	-	-	0.01	-	-	-	-
Peterson Complex	20 (9)	20 (7)	20 (14)	20 (3)	20 (0)	0.92	0.91	0.87	0.86	0.19	0.51	0.37	0.74	0.20	0.00
Pidgen	18 (0)	-	-	-	-	0.09	-	-	-	-	0.00	-	-	-	-
Pit	-	-	-	20 (2)	20 (0)	-	-	-	0.86	0.45	-	-	-	0.11	0.00
Piute 08	20 (0)	19 (0)	-	-	20 (0)	0.37	0.23	-	-	0.18	0.00	0.00	-	-	0.00
Plum	12 (0)	12 (0)	12 (0)	13 (0)	-	0.29	0.22	0.12	0.23	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-
Power	20(1)	20 (0)	20 (0)	20 (2)	20 (0)	0.86	0.18	0.13	0.85	0.06	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.00
Ramsey	-	-	-	-	20 (8)	-	-	-	-	0.96	-	-	-	-	0.43
Reading	-	-	-	-	20 (12)	-	-	-	-	0.96	-	-	-	-	0.62
Rich	21 (1)	21 (1)	-	21 (6)	-	0.91	0.91	-	0.86	-	0.12	0.08	-	0.31	-
Sawmill 00	5 (0)	-	-	-	-	0.17	-	-	-	-	0.01	-	-	-	-
Sawmill 06	-	-	19 (0)	-	20 (0)	-	-	0.16	-	0.11	-	-	0.00	-	0.00
Scotch	21 (3)	21 (0)	-	21 (1)	20 (2)	0.91	0.29	-	0.86	0.86	0.22	0.01	-	0.09	0.12
Sheep	-	-	-	20 (1)	20 (0)	-	-	-	0.86	0.41	-	-	-	0.06	0.00
Sherwin	-	-	-	-	13 (4)	-	-	-	-	0.87	-	-	-	-	0.45
Shotgun	-	-	-	16 (3)	-	-	-	-	0.86	-	-	-	-	0.20	-
Showers	9 (3)	9 (6)	-	8 (4)	-	0.82	0.79	-	0.84	-	0.52	0.72	-	0.55	-
Silver	-	-	11 (7)	11 (6)	11 (5)	-	-	0.88	0.87	0.90	-	-	0.68	0.56	0.46
Star	-	20 (6)	20 (1)	-	-	-	0.77	0.79	-	-	-	0.35	0.18	-	-
Storrie	15 (4)	-	-	-	-	0.80	-	-	-	-	0.48	-	-	-	-
Straylor	-	-	-	20(1)	20 (0)	-	-	-	0.85	0.06	-	-	-	0.13	0.00

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013										
Fire name	Detects.	Detects.	Detects.	Detects.	Detects.	ω_{2009}	ω_{2010}	ω_{2011}	ω_{2012}	ω_{2013}	ψ_{2009}	ψ_{2010}	ψ_{2011}	ψ_{2012}	ψ_{2013}
	(# stns)														
Stream	20 (0)	20 (0)	15 (0)	-	-	0.11	0.09	0.11	-	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-
Sugar Loaf	-	21 (3)	21 (2)	21 (0)	21 (0)	-	0.92	0.88	0.15	0.23	-	0.17	0.29	0.00	0.00
Summit	-	-	16 (0)	-	16 (0)	-	-	0.14	-	0.04	-	-	0.00	-	0.00
Tamarack	-	-	-	20 (3)	20 (0)	-	-	-	0.85	0.11	-	-	-	0.16	0.00
Tehipite	-	-	-	21 (9)	21 (11)	-	-	-	0.86	0.87	-	-	-	0.44	0.55
Treasure	10 (2)	10 (4)	-	-	-	0.80	0.77	-	-	-	0.29	0.42	-	-	-
Vista	19 (9)	19 (8)	19 (2)	19 (5)	-	0.90	0.90	0.86	0.85	-	0.52	0.50	0.17	0.29	-
Whit	20 (6)	-	20 (7)	19 (9)	19 (4)	0.84	-	0.82	0.84	0.67	0.36	-	0.41	0.49	0.28
						0.60	0.65	0.48	0.78	0.52	0.25	0.19	0.21	0.24	0.18
Total	899	860	895	953	1008	(0.55	(0.59	(0.48	(0.75	(0.47	(0.22	(0.17	(0.18	(0.23	(0.17
Total	(169)	(132)	(148)	(207)	(165)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
						0.67)	0.71)	0.50)	0.83)	0.58)	0.31)	0.21)	0.24)	0.26)	0.20)

Models of annual occupancy show changes in the total estimated proportion of (sampled) fire areas occupied by at least one Black-backed Woodpecker in different years (Table 3). The proportion of occupied fire areas (ω) in 2009 and 2010 appears to have been relatively stable (0.60 and 0.65, respectively, with overlapping confidence intervals), while the proportion in 2011 was significantly lower (0.48). This proportion then increased significantly in 2012 (0.78) and dropped again to approximately 2011-levels in 2013 (0.52, 95% CI: 0.47 – 0.58). Given that different fires were sampled in different years, these differences are difficult to interpret. However, there were six fires (Table 3) where Black-backed Woodpeckers were not detected in 2011 but were detected in 2012, but no fires where detections occurred in 2013 but not 2012. While these metrics suggest real increases in population size between 2011 and 2012, and losses between 2012 and 2013, actual changes in colonization or extinction are best understood through dynamic occupancy models (see next section).

We compared modeled covariate relationships with occupancy and detectability for each of the five annual occupancy models (Table 4). Covariate signs showed general consistency across years, with 2013 showing similar parameter magnitudes and posteriors as in previous years. Elevation and snag density remain the strongest two predictors of Black-backed Woodpecker occurrence at the point level, with confidence intervals that overlapped 0 in 2013 for effects of latitude, burn severity, and pre-fire canopy cover. Unlike 2012 (a year with high overall occupancy), fire age was a very strong factor for fire-level occurrence in 2013, similar to 2009 and 2010. Of the factors affecting detectability, survey type (i.e., passive versus broadcast) remains the only covariate which is significant across all 5 years (broadcast has a higher detection rate than passive).

Parameter	Year				
Fire level occupancy probability	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
σ_{f} (variance of	6.5	6.34	6.2	6.4	6.2
random fire effect)	(0.93 - 9.87)	(1.05 - 9.85)	(0.57 - 9.86)	(0.89 - 9.86)	(0.45 - 9.88)
γ_1 (fire age)	-2.76	-3.23	-1.83	-0.49	-5.81
	(-6.580.14)	(-7.420.39)	(-5.15 - 0.44)	(-3.77 - 2.49)	(-11.91.35)
Point-level occupancy probability					
β_0	-1.01	-1.17	-0.45	-0.97	-1.01
	(-1.370.61)	(-1.470.86)	(-0.760.11)	(-1.190.77)	(-1.330.70)
β_1 (latitude)	0.54	-0.26	0.22	0.53	-0.06
-	(0.17 - 1.01)	(-0.53 – 0.00)	(-0.06 - 0.52)	(0.34 - 0.73)	(-0.33 – 0.21)
β_2 (elevation)	1.20	0.81	-0.07	0.53	1.00
	(0.70 - 1.91)	(0.45 - 1.16)	(-0.37 - 0.24)	(0.27 - 0.80)	(0.60 - 1.41)
β_3 (snag density)	0.08	0.29	0.10	0.36	0.45
	(-0.18 - 0.32)	(0.00 - 0.60)	(-0.15 - 0.36)	(0.18 - 0.54)	(0.23 - 0.70)
β_4 (burn severity)	0.37	0.21	0.20	0.03	0.25
	(0.06 - 0.72)	(-0.05 - 0.47)	(-0.09 - 0.49)	(-0.18 - 0.22)	(0.00 - 0.50)
eta_5 (pre-fire canopy	0.06	0.35	0.22	-0.21	-0.31
cover)	(-0.22 - 0.33)	(0.06 - 0.63)	(-0.03 - 0.48)	(-0.410.01)	(-0.31 - 0.24)
Detection probability					
α_0	-3.45	-1.57	-1.2	-0.94	-1.33
	(-4.412.65)	(-1.891.25)	(-1.580.83)	(-1.240.63)	(-1.710.97)
α_1 (interval duration)	1.94	0.72	0.09	0.25	0.23
	(1.11 - 2.91)	(0.14 - 1.31)	(-0.51 - 0.68)	(-0.25 – 0.75)	(-0.39 – 0.84)
α_2 (survey type)	2.83	1.05	0.67	0.92	1.37
	(2.03 - 3.77)	(0.65 - 1.47)	(0.22 - 1.12)	(0.53 - 1.30)	(0.92 - 1.83)
α_3 (day of year)	-0.24	-0.16	0.01	0.07	0.03
	(-0.54 - 0.06)	(-0.41 - 0.08)	(-0.21 - 0.22)	(-0.11 – 0.26)	(-0.20 – 0.26)

Table 4. Posterior summaries (means and 95% credible intervals) for intercepts and regression coefficients for single-year occupancy models as applied to 2009-2013 survey data.

Analysis of Dynamic Occupancy

Of the 1756 survey points, 1249 (71%) were surveyed in more than one year and 191 (11%) were surveyed in all five years. Of those points that were surveyed in more than one year, 237 (19%) showed apparent colonizations (i.e., not detected in one year, detected in subsequent) and 305 (24%) showed apparent extinctions. This degree of apparent occurrence change (31%) at revisited points facilitated the building of dynamic occupancy models focused on the estimation of point-specific colonization and extinction probabilities.

The analysis of three years of data (Siegel et al. 2012) exploring 56 model parameterizations of detectability and initial occupancy resulted in strong support for the saturated model, which included survey duration, survey type, and day of year as covariates of detectability, and

elevation, elevation², and latitude as covariates of initial occupancy. For the current analysis we re-evaluated the importance of these different factors. The top model selected (AIC weight = 0.32; AIC = 2612.66) retained all variables except for survey type. This selection of three initial occupancy and two detectability variables were used for all subsequent models.

Model support for colonization and extinction models was broadly distributed across many similar candidate models (Table 5). Ten models were within 2 AIC units of each other, an index often used to delineate models with "substantial support" (Burnham and Anderson 2002). These 10 models, together, comprised 40% of the total AIC model weight. The covariates selected were very similar to those selected previously using fewer years of data (Siegel et al. 2012, 2014).

Colonization covariates	Extinction covariates	K	AIC	Δ_i	Wi
Snag density + fire age	Burn severity + fire age	13	2569.0	0.00	0.07
Snag density + fire age	Burn severity	12	2569.6	0.58	0.06
Snag density + fire age	Burn severity + canopy cover	13	2569.9	0.81	0.05
Snag density + fire age	Burn severity + canopy cover + fire age	14	2570.5	1.40	0.04
Snag density + fire age	Fire age	12	2570.6	1.55	0.03
Snag density + fire age	Burn severity + snag density + fire age	14	2570.7	1.65	0.03
Snag density + fire age	Null	11	2570.7	1.68	0.03
Snag density + fire age	Snag density + fire age	13	2570.8	1.80	0.03
Snag density + fire age + burn severity	Burn severity + fire age	14	2571.0	1.92	0.03
Snag density + fire age + canopy cover	Burn severity + fire age	14	2571.0	2.00	0.03

Table 5. Top models (Δ_i < 2) comparing different combinations of colonization and extinction covariates for point-level changes in occupancy.

Although there is no single clear "top model" for colonization and extinction models, there is general consistency in support for certain variables. For instance, all top models within 2 AIC units included both snag density and fire age as colonization covariates, while there was greater uncertainty with regard to important variables for extinction covariates (Table 5). Of the variables tested, burn severity (% change in canopy cover) was included in 7 of the 10 models within 2 AIC units.

The differences between colonization and extinction are clearly shown by the cumulative AIC weight ("relative importance" or $w_+(j)$; Burnham and Anderson 2002) in support of different covariates for colonization and extinction (Table 6). Both snag density and fire age have nearly full, universal support as covariates of colonization, while other variables had little support (< 0.3). There is essentially no support (< 0.01) for models that had colonization as a random process at a fixed probability. In comparison, the cumulative weights for covariates of extinction showed much more widespread, ambiguous support, with the best being moderate support (> 0.6) for burn severity. There is a non-zero probability (0.06) that extinction is a purely random occurrence.

Covariate	Colonization relative importance score	Extinction relative importance score
Null (random)	0.00	0.06
Snag density	0.99	0.37
Fire age	0.98	0.51
Burn severity	0.28	0.61
Pre-fire canopy cover	0.29	0.40

Table 6. Cumulative AIC weights in support of individual covariates in compared models for both colonization and extinction probabilities.

With each new year of data, the relationships between environmental factors and colonization and extinction dynamics continue to strengthen. Compared to previous years' analyses with only three or four years of data, the current analysis with five years of data shows consistent improvement in inference (Figure 7). Confidence in support for colonization as a function of fire age and snag density has increased to near universal support. Additionally, with each additional year of data, support for burn severity as a covariate of extinction has increased. Additional years of data are expected to clarify these covariate relationships, particularly for extinction probability.



Figure 7. Changes in cumulative AIC weights (e.g., Table 6) for each of 4 covariate relationships with colonization (a) and extinction (b) over three consecutive analysis years. Analysis beginning in 2011 was based on three years of data while the current analysis is based on five years of data. Lines show increasing clarification of covariate relationships with additional data.

Of critical interest is the sign and magnitude of covariate relationships to probabilities of colonization and extinction (Table 7). Although parameter estimates across all 256 colonization-extinction models showed relatively consistent modeled responses, robust inference on covariate relationships across all models utilized model averaging (Burnham and Anderson 2002) of models weighted by AIC (Figure 8). Model averaged results show relatively low average probabilities of colonization and high probabilities of extinction. Colonization probability, however, strongly increases with snag density and decreases with fire age. Extinction probability shows no significant results, but parameter estimates for burn severity indicate that site extinction probability may decrease with burn severity.



Figure 8. Modeled covariate relationships with probability of colonization (a-d) and extinction (e-h). Plots show model averaged mean covariate relationships (solid black line) and 95% confidence interval for slopes (dotted black line). Additionally, modeled relationships for each of the 128 models containing each covariate are plotted individually (blue lines), with line transparency indicating AIC weight for each model. Darker shades of blue indicate a stronger model (see also Table 6 for relative importance values/scores). Closer proximity of the blue lines to the model average (solid black line) indicates more consistent support for the modeled relationship of that variable across competing models. In some cases blue lines are obscured by the black line. Confidence intervals show uncertainty in the slope of the modeled covariate relationship, such that only (a) and (b) indicate significant, high-certainty relationships.

Analysis of Multispecies Habitat Relationships

A total of 128 non-aquatic bird species has been detected during passive bird surveys at Blackbacked Woodpecker points (Appendix I). In 2013, eleven new species were detected on point counts that had not previously been detected: Cedar Waxwing, Western Grebe, Double-crested Cormorant, Pied-billed Grebe, Ring-necked Duck, Grasshopper Sparrow, Pine Grosbeak, Eurasian Collared-Dove, Gadwall, Flammulated Owl, and Northern Saw-whet Owl. Our goals for the present analysis were to assess how species' detections related to habitat structure, including variables that could be used for planning post-fire forest management activities.

Simply inspecting mean values of points with detections for burn severity, fire age, snag and live tree basal area, and shrub cover can provide important insights into the diversity of species using post-fire habitats (Table 7). Many species associated with early post-fire years (e.g., Hermit Thrush, Hermit Warbler, Pine Siskin, Townsend's Solitaire) are also associated with higher live-tree basal area. At the opposite end of the spectrum are species more frequently detected at fires

Table 7. All bird species with >10 detections across all years of surveys, and means and standard deviations of habitat associations. Habitat association values are calculated from the actual values for that variable (e.g., the mean fire age of all sites with detections for a species) and do not represent model coefficients. However, habitat values in bold signify covariate relationships designated as significant (p < 0.05) by a GLMM.

			Burn	Snag basal	Live tree	Shrub
	No. of	Fire age	Severity	area	basal area	cover
Species Name	detections	(yrs)	(% change)	(m^2/ha)	(m^2/ha)	(%)
Mountain Quail	42	5.9 (0.5)	42.2 (5.1)	9.2 (1.8)	17.1 (3.3)	24.5 (5)
Mourning Dove	41	4 (0.4)	50.7 (6.2)	15.6 (3)	14.8 (3.9)	14.8 (4.4)
Anna's Hummingbird	74	5.1 (0.3)	43.9 (3.8)	9.6 (1.9)	15.2 (2.2)	21.3 (2.7)
Calliope Hummingbird	13	4.5 (0.8)	40.7 (11.3)	7.1 (5.4)	7.8 (3)	20.8 (5)
Acorn Woodpecker	24	7 (0.6)	39.8 (7.2)	8.6 (2.3)	14.7 (3.3)	14.4 (3.4)
Williamson's Sapsucker	16	6.4 (0.8)	22.4 (8.4)	14.2 (3.8)	19.1 (3.7)	8.6 (4.1)
Red-breasted Sapsucker	55	6.7 (0.4)	26.1 (3.9)	7.8 (1.3)	23.9 (2.8)	14.9 (2.7)
Hairy Woodpecker	194	4.9 (0.2)	48.8 (2.7)	21.8 (1.8)	17.3 (1.8)	18.8 (1.8)
White-headed Woodpecker	103	5.9 (0.3)	34.5 (3.3)	15.8 (1.8)	27.3 (2.9)	16.9 (2.3)
Black-backed Woodpecker	41	4.2 (0.4)	57.8 (5.7)	30.1 (4)	11.8 (2.3)	16.3 (3.8)
Northern Flicker	100	6.5 (0.3)	49.9 (3.7)	13.6 (1.9)	13.8 (1.7)	19.3 (2.6)
Olive-sided Flycatcher	117	6.1 (0.2)	38.7 (3)	14.7 (1.7)	21.6 (2.3)	19.1 (2)
Western Wood-Pewee	320	5.7 (0.2)	31.7 (1.8)	13.7 (1.1)	22.8 (1.3)	14.4 (1.2)
Hammond's Flycatcher	40	4.9 (0.4)	9.2 (2.6)	8.7 (1.7)	38.3 (4.3)	10.6 (2.9)
Gray Flycatcher	46	6.2 (0.5)	47.1 (5.2)	9.9 (2.9)	10.2 (1.8)	11.7 (3.2)
Dusky Flycatcher	281	5.1 (0.2)	36.3 (2.1)	15.9 (1.3)	23.7 (1.5)	19.6 (1.5)
Pacific-slope Flycatcher	15	4.3 (0.6)	13.5 (5.3)	14.8 (6.7)	35.5 (5.9)	4.9 (1.2)
Cassin's Vireo	92	4.9 (0.3)	17.5 (2.8)	8.1 (1.1)	39.1 (3.6)	13.6 (2.2)
Warbling Vireo	98	6 (0.3)	17.6 (2.5)	10.7 (1.3)	29.7 (2.4)	14.4 (2.2)
Steller's Jay	263	5.7 (0.2)	37.1 (2.1)	13.7 (1.2)	23.9 (1.5)	15.8 (1.4)
Western Scrub-Jay	16	5.9 (0.7)	42.9 (7.3)	12.8 (3.4)	11 (2.9)	15.1 (4.8)
Clark's Nutcracker	31	6.3 (0.4)	34.5 (5.5)	13.9 (3.1)	17.4 (2.3)	10.1 (2.5)
Common Raven	20	6.4 (0.6)	48.9 (8)	11.9 (3.5)	9.2 (2.2)	27.4 (6.8)
Tree Swallow	22	7.4 (0.6)	83.5 (4.4)	10.3 (2.7)	2.4 (1)	31.5 (7.5)
Violet-green Swallow	22	7.2 (0.6)	59.4 (7)	13.8 (4)	4.5 (2.5)	26.3 (6.5)
Mountain Chickadee	566	5.7 (0.1)	27.8 (1.2)	13.6 (0.8)	25.9 (1)	13.6 (0.9)
Bushtit	13	7.3 (0.8)	53.8 (10)	2.5 (1.2)	9.9 (5.3)	28.6 (5.8)
Red-breasted Nuthatch	244	4.9 (0.2)	21.7 (1.7)	14.4 (1.2)	30.4 (1.7)	11.3 (1.1)
White-breasted Nuthatch	89	5.9 (0.3)	40.6 (3.5)	12.5 (1.4)	18.8 (2.2)	14 (2.5)
Pygmy Nuthatch	52	6.8 (0.4)	41.4 (4.5)	10.9 (2.1)	19.7 (3.4)	19.7 (3.7)
Brown Creeper	385	5.6 (0.1)	30.3 (1.6)	17.6 (1.2)	27.5 (1.5)	12.4 (0.9)
Rock Wren	41	5.8 (0.4)	64 (5)	9.6 (2.2)	3.6 (1)	14 (2.8)
Bewick's Wren	13	5.3 (0.6)	55.6 (9.3)	17.1 (5.6)	8.3 (3.2)	17.5 (4.9)
House Wren	254	6.7 (0.2)	66 (2.1)	15 (1.4)	9.4 (1)	26.6 (1.7)
Blue-gray Gnatcatcher	17	6.7 (0.6)	41.7 (7)	2.8 (1.2)	6.5 (1.7)	23 (5.4)
Golden-crowned Kinglet	61	5.5 (0.4)	12.3 (2.6)	14.1 (2)	38 (3.2)	10.8 (1.9)

			Burn	Snag basal	Live tree	Shrub
Spacios Noma	No. of	Fire age	Severity	area (m^2/h_a)	basal area (m^2/h_a)	cover
Western Dheshind		(yrs)	(% change)	(III /IIa)	(111/11a)	(%)
Western Bluebird	80 110	5.7(0.5)	57(3.7)	15.1(1.9)	9.9 (1.5)	25.5(5.1)
	110	6.3 (0.2)	62.1 (3.3)	14.4 (1.6)	7.5 (1.1)	16.6(2.3)
I ownsend's Solitaire	/6	4.4 (0.3)	27.6 (3.7)	17.9 (2.8)	32.6 (3.7)	9.3 (1.8)
Hermit Thrush	17	3.4 (0.7)	5.9 (3)	13.8 (4.1)	30.5 (4.7)	4.6 (1.9)
American Robin	371	5.5 (0.1)	32.4 (1.8)	13.2 (1)	20.2 (1)	13.5 (1.1)
Wrentit	13	6.8 (1)	57.1 (7.6)	6.7 (3)	6 (2.3)	20.7 (5.2)
European Starling	13	6.8 (0.7)	68.2 (8.8)	9.7 (3)	4.8 (2.2)	6.2 (2.7)
Orange-crowned Warbler	37	7.6 (0.4)	52.8 (6.2)	11.9 (2.3)	10.2 (2.3)	40.6 (4.6)
Nashville Warbler	120	6 (0.3)	38.5 (3.1)	8.8 (1)	18.3 (1.7)	21.6 (2.3)
Yellow Warbler	39	7.7 (0.4)	58.5 (6.1)	14.1 (3.5)	18 (3.8)	35.3 (5)
Yellow-rumped Warbler	372	5 (0.1)	22 (1.5)	14.8 (1.1)	31.6 (1.4)	11.2 (1)
Black-throated Gray Warbler	22	4 (0.5)	19.4 (5.5)	10.3 (4.2)	19.7 (6.1)	14.9 (4.2)
Hermit Warbler	75	4.2 (0.3)	11.7 (2.2)	13.7 (2.3)	43.2 (3.9)	7.7 (1.4)
MacGillivray's Warbler	140	6.4 (0.2)	41.6 (3.1)	14.8 (1.7)	21.8 (1.9)	26.1 (2.2)
Wilson's Warbler	24	5.5 (0.4)	41.5 (6.9)	13.9 (4)	18.3 (4.1)	22.6 (4.2)
Green-tailed Towhee	234	7.2 (0.2)	57.2 (2.2)	12.2 (0.9)	10.7 (1)	28.4 (1.9)
Spotted Towhee	289	5.7 (0.2)	45.1 (2.2)	10.3 (0.8)	14.4 (1.1)	22.5 (1.5)
Chipping Sparrow	193	5.3 (0.2)	41.4 (2.5)	8.8 (0.9)	18.4 (1.5)	16.5 (1.8)
Brewer's Sparrow	20	8.1 (0.4)	68.5 (6.5)	6.9 (2.6)	7.2 (4.8)	10.7 (3.4)
Fox Sparrow	393	6.6 (0.1)	49 (1.8)	16.3 (1.2)	17.1 (1)	27.8 (1.4)
Lincoln's Sparrow	14	5.6 (0.7)	41.5 (9.8)	26.6 (6.9)	19.7 (5.6)	8.1 (2.8)
Dark-Eyed Junco	681	5.4 (0.1)	31.1 (1.3)	15.2 (0.8)	22.9 (0.9)	13.7 (0.8)
Western Tanager	371	5 (0.1)	26.6 (1.5)	13.3 (0.9)	30.1 (1.5)	12.4 (1)
Black-headed Grosbeak	137	5 (0.2)	37.1 (2.8)	9.7 (1.1)	18 (1.8)	18.2 (2.1)
Lazuli Bunting	207	5.4 (0.2)	59 (2.5)	11.1 (1.3)	12.9 (1.4)	23.1 (1.9)
Western Meadowlark	15	5.3 (0.4)	54.5 (7.4)	11.6 (3.8)	7.7 (2)	16.9 (7.4)
Brewer's Blackbird	65	5.8 (0.3)	56 (4.4)	9.1 (2)	5.9 (1.2)	17.8 (2.7)
Brown-headed Cowbird	79	5.3 (0.3)	43.1 (4.3)	11.9 (2.4)	13.7 (2.1)	13.8 (2.2)
Purple Finch	30	4.6 (0.5)	28.7 (5)	11.9 (3.6)	23.7 (4.2)	20.4 (4.9)
Cassin's Finch	170	5.4 (0.2)	36.1 (2.6)	16.2 (1.5)	22.2 (2.2)	11.9 (1.5)
House Finch	20	6.4 (0.6)	65.1 (6.3)	9.3 (2)	6.5 (1.8)	9.2 (3.6)
Red Crossbill	17	5.8 (0.8)	33.3 (10)	8.5 (3.8)	11.6 (2.9)	23.9 (10)
Pine Siskin	52	3.8 (0.3)	29 (4.9)	15.3 (3)	29.3 (5)	13.4 (3.9)
Lesser Goldfinch	48	4.8 (0.4)	46.3 (5.3)	7.7 (1.3)	10.7 (2.4)	19.6 (3.5)
Evening Grosbeak	16	5.3 (0.7)	24.6 (7.2)	14.8 (3.8)	37.7 (9.1)	14.6 (5.3)

>7 years (e.g., Green-tailed Towhee, Orange-crowned Warbler, Yellow Warbler, Brewer's Sparrow), and these species are also generally associated with high burn severity (e.g., Brewer's Sparrow) and/or high shrub cover (e.g., Orange-crowned Warbler). A few species had significant

associations with low snag basal area and were typically species associated with open areas or shrub-dominated areas (e.g., Bushtit, Lesser Goldfinch, Cassin's Vireo, Chipping Sparrow). Black-backed Woodpecker was the species with the highest mean snag basal area where it occurred, but other species with significant relationships with high snag basal area included Hairy Woodpecker, Townsend's Solitaire, Brown Creeper, and Dark-eyed Junco.

Discussion

Black-backed Woodpecker Annual Occupancy

Our fifth year of surveys indicate that Black-backed Woodpeckers continue to be widely distributed across recent fire areas on the ten National forests in our study area, with the proportion of occupied fires and points lower in 2013 then any other year of sampling, but statistically no different than 2010 or 2011. Point estimates of the percentage of occupied survey points within each year's sampling frame have varied across years: 25% in 2009, 19% in 2010, 21% in 2011, 24% in 2012, and 18% in 2013. The estimated percentage of occupied fires within the sampling frame has shown greater changes: 60% in 2009, 65% in 2010, 48% in 2011, 78% in 2012, and 52% in 2013. At this time there is no evidence of a temporal trend in occupancy rates during the five years (2009-2013) we have been monitoring Black-backed Woodpeckers on National Forests in California, or of a broad-scale change in the species' distribution in California. Although the distribution of the species appears to change slightly from year to year, Black-backed Woodpeckers remain present across their historic range in California.

Of particular interest is whether Black-backed Woodpecker occupancy within sampled fires in our study region is significantly changing from year to year. Based on the results of annual occupancy models, the total proportion of occupied points in 2010 was significantly lower than in 2009, indicating a drop in occupancy. In 2011, the proportion of occupied sites was not statistically different from that in 2010, and 95% confidence intervals overlap with estimates from 2009. In 2012, occupancy was significantly higher than 2010 and 2011, and on par with levels in 2009. Finally, in 2013, occupancy was significantly lower than in 2012, but no different from 2010 or 2011. Consequently, Black-backed Woodpecker populations appear to be variable from year to year but no consistent trend is currently apparent.

It is important, yet challenging, to disentangle changes in both the proportion of occupied fires and the proportion of occupied points. The sampling frame changes from year-to-year, so the proportion of occupied fires will likely to be sensitive to this, and may partially or wholly account for the apparent significant drop in occupied fires in 2013 or the rise in 2012. Across all five years of sampling the estimated proportion of occupied survey points has stayed within 1825% (based on yearly means), showing greater stability as a metric. Because the proportion of occupied points is less sensitive to annual changes in the sampling frame and/or the randomly selected subset of the sampling frame that is actually sampled, it may be a superior index of population size for monitoring Black-backed Woodpecker populations across years.

Black-backed Woodpecker Dynamic Occupancy

Our results from 5 years of data indicate strong differences between colonization and extinction dynamics of Black-backed Woodpeckers in burned forests. Average colonization probability (defined here as the probability of a single survey point becoming occupied by woodpeckers given that it was previously unoccupied subsequent to the fire) was quite low (6.5%), while average extinction probability was much higher (72%). Despite being low, the probability of a site being colonized was strongly positively associated with snag density and strongly negatively associated with fire age. Thus, early post-fire sites with high snag densities have a relatively higher probability of being colonized than other sites. By comparison, no single factor was strongly associated with extinction, with a moderate negative association with burn severity (i.e., more severe fires make extinction less likely). Inferential trends over multiple years of repeating this analysis with increasing amounts of data suggest that the relationship between burn severity and extinction probability is likely important (i.e., real) and may become increasingly apparent with additional years of data. Previous analyses of occupancy dynamics (Siegel et al. 2012, 2014) have indicated extinction was purely random. The current analysis suggests that this is unlikely.

The differences between the relative frequency of colonization versus extinction as well as the strength of covariate relationships of colonization versus extinction lead to novel insight on the drivers behind changes in Black-backed Woodpecker occurrence. Based on analyses limited to modeling occupancy (e.g., Siegel et al. 2011, Saracco et al. 2011, Table 4), we tend to think of occurrence as being limited predominantly by fire age and snag density. This leads to the assumption that an occupied site may go extinct because the site has aged to a certain point, and that the critical age at which a site goes extinct depends on habitat quality characteristics, such as snag density.

Our results, however, suggest that the mechanistic pathway is actually the opposite. Extinction appears to be a relatively likely event, but one with weak controls (except, perhaps for burn severity). That does not mean that other factors that were not investigated (e.g., post-fire management actions that change habitat) do not have an effect on extinction, but that extinction appears to occur with no strong relationship to the investigated covariates. By contrast, colonization (after fires are greater than 1 year old) is a relatively unlikely event, but one which is strongly associated with both fire age and snag density. Despite being unlikely, since overall point-level occupancy is only around 18 to 25% (see previous section), colonization is a relatively common occurrence. For example, given an overall occupancy of 20% and modeled average probabilities of colonization and extinction, assuming all sites have average covariate values, we would expect 14% of all points to go extinct in a given year and 5% of all points to become colonized. Colonization after one year post-fire, consequently, is an important dynamic strongly influencing the observed distribution on a landscape. If management actions were to be taken aimed at increasing overall occupancy, these results suggest that colonization should be targeted rather than extinction, presumably through the retention of early post-fire stands with high snag densities.

The importance of colonization as a driver of occurrence dynamics for Black-backed Woodpeckers in burned forests suggests a sort-of "grass is always greener" scenario, or more accurately, a "trees are always blacker" one. Although little is known about dispersal dynamics in Black-backed Woodpeckers, the birds in our greater Sierra Nevada study area may frequently have the potential to colonize younger post-fire forests, as adequately large fires burn throughout the region during most years. So, for a woodpecker inhabiting a 6-year old fire area, whether or not it moves to a newer fire area may not be determined by the characteristics of the site it currently occupies, but rather by whether there is a better, more recently burned site nearby to colonize. Thus extinction may not be a function of the patch itself, but a consequence of the proximity to desirable colonization options and the capacity to find them.

Multi-species Occupancy within Post-fire Forests

Our analyses strongly support the notion that bird communities change in a complex manner in the decade immediately post-fire. A surprisingly high number of species (128) have now been

recorded during surveys on post-fire landscapes, representing approximately 20% of all bird species ever recorded in California (undoubtedly it would be a much higher percentage if restricted to California's breeding species). The results highlight that no single set of post-fire conditions will be beneficial to all members of post-fire bird communities. Rather, post-fire communities will be determined by fine-scale habitat and structural features defined by the intersection of fire age, burn severity, relative abundance of snags, live trees, and shrubs, and presumably other topographical and environmental features.

Interestingly, compared to other bird species, Black-backed Woodpeckers appear at one extreme end with regards to their habitat preference. The average snag density of points with Blackbacked Woodpeckers (30 m^2 /ha) was the highest of all species. Next highest species were Lincoln's Sparrow (27 m^2 /ha but with a high variance) and Hairy Woodpecker (22 m^2 /ha), and all other species had mean snag basal areas < 18 m^2 /ha. Black-backed Woodpeckers are also found in areas with relatively high burn severity (mean = 58% canopy cover change), but consistent with more rigorous analyses (e.g., Table 4), this relationship does not appear as important as factors such as snag density. Meanwhile, many other species are more strongly associated with high severity fire (e.g., Tree Swallow, Brewer's Sparrow, House Wren) but not associated with high snag density.

Altogether, the multi-species analyses indicate that post-fire landscapes are highly heterogenous over time and space, and this diversity represents important habitat for a large number of species. While some species may only casually use burns or were detected due to other habitat features (e.g., water), a total of 62 species (48%) have been recorded during multi-species surveys in all 5 years, and 38 species (30%) have been detected on over 50 surveys, indicating a fairly large core 'burned forest' community. Given the diversity of habitat associations across species, however (Table 7), any single management metric (e.g., burn severity or snag density) will be unlikely to be beneficial to all species that utilize post-fire forests.

Acknowledgments

We thank Chrissy Howell and Diana Craig for supporting this project in numerous ways; Don Yasuda and Jay Miller for helping us obtain and interpret fire severity data; Patricia Flebbe for helpful advice on survey design and methods; and Dayna Mauer, Michael McGrann, Lynn Schofield, Stephen Shunk, and Joanna Wu for conducting field surveys in 2013. We also thank the numerous Forest Service personnel who provided logistical support and/or helpful information about specific fire areas on each of the ten national forest units. This project was funded by the Pacific Southwest Region of the USDA Forest Service and was conducted by The Institute for Bird Populations' Sierra Nevada Bird Observatory. This is Contribution No. 480 of The Institute for Bird Populations.

Literature Cited

- Buckland, S. T., D. R. Anderson, K. P. Burnham, J. L. Laake, D. L. Borchers, and L. Thomas.
 2001. Introduction to distance sampling: estimating abundance of biological populations.
 Oxford University Press.
- Bull, E. L., S. R. Peterson, and J. W. Thomas. 1986. Resource partitioning among woodpeckers in northeastern Oregon. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station Note PNW-44.
- Burnham, K. P., and D. R. Anderson. 2002. Model Selection and Multimodel Inference. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- California Department of Fish and Game. 2005. California Wildlife Habitat Relationships (CWHR) version 8.1. California Department of Fish and Game, Interagency Wildlife Task Group, Sacramento, CA.
- Farnsworth, G. L., K. H. Pollock, J. D. Nichols, T. R. Simons, J. E. Hines, and J. R. Sauer. 2002. A removal method for estimating detection probabilities from point count surveys. Auk 119:414-425.
- Fiske, I. and R. Chandler. 2011. Unmarked: An R package for fitting hierarchical models of wildlife occurrence and abundance. Journal of Statistical Software 43(10):1-23.
- Gesch, D. B. 2007. The National Elevation Dataset. Pages 99-118 in Digital Elevation Model Technologies and Applications: The DEM Users Manual, 2nd Edition (D. Maune, Ed.).American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, Bethesda, MD.
- Gesch, D. B., M. Oimoen, S. Greenlee, C. Nelson, M. Steuck, and D. Tyler. 2002. The National Elevation Dataset. Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing 68:5-11.
- Gilks, W. R., S. Richardson, and D. J. Spiegelhalter. 1996. Introducing Markov change Monte Carlo. Pages 1-20 in Markov chain Monte Carlo methods in practice (W. R. Gilks, S. Richardson, and D. J. Spiegelhalter, Eds.). Chapman and Hall, New York.

- Goggans, R., R. D. Dixon, and L. C. Seminara. 1988. Habitat use by Three-toed and Blackbacked Woodpeckers, Deschutes National Forest, Oregon. Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, USDA Deschutes National Forest, Nongame Project No. 87-3-02.
- Hijmans, R.J. and J. van Etten. 2012. Raster: Geographic data analysis and modeling. R package version 2.0-31.
- Hutto, R. L. 1995. Composition of bird communities following stand-replacement fires in northern Rocky Mountain (USA) conifer forests. Conservation Biology 9:1041-1058.
- Kotliar, N. B., S. J. Hejl, R. L. Hutto, V. A. Saab, C. P. Melcher, and M. E. McFadzen. 2002. Effects of fire and post-fire salvage logging on avian communities in conifer-dominated forests of the western United States. Studies in Avian Biology 25:49-64.
- Lester, A. N. 1980. Numerical response of woodpeckers and their effect on mortality of mountain pine beetles in lodgepole pine in northeastern Montana. M.A., University of Montana, Missoula.
- MacKenzie, D. I., J. D. Nichols, J. E. Hines, M. G. Knutson, and A. B. Franklin. 2003. Estimating site occupancy, colonization, and local extinction when a species is detected imperfectly. Ecology 84:2200-2207.
- Miller, J. D., E. E. Knapp, C. H. Key, C. N. Skinner, C. J. Isbell, R. M. Creasy, and J. W. Sherlock. 2009. Calibration and validation of the relative differenced normalized Burn Ratio (RdNBR) to three measures of fire severity in the Sierra Nevada and Klamath Mountains, California, USA. Remote Sensing of the Environment 113:645-656.
- Murphy, E. C., and W. A. Lehnhausen. 1998. Density and foraging ecology of woodpeckers following a stand-replacement fire. Journal of Wildlife Management 62:1359-1372.
- Powell, H. 2000. The influence of prey density on post-fire habitat use of the Black-backed Woodpecker. M.A., University of Montana, Missoula.

- Plummer, M. 2003. JAGS: a program for analysis of Bayesian graphical models using Gibbs sampling. In: Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Distributed Statistical Computing 1091 (Hornik, K. et al., eds), pp. 20–22.
- R Core Team. 2014. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Raphael, M. G., and M. White. 1984. Use of snags by cavity-nesting birds in the Sierra Nevada. In, Wildlife Monographs, vol. 86. The Wildlife Society, Washington, DC.
- Royle, J. A., and R. M. Dorazio. 2008. Hierarchical Modeling and Inference in Ecology. Academic Press, San Diego.
- Saracco, J. F., R. B. Siegel, and R. L. Wilkerson. 2011. Occupancy modeling of Black-backed Woodpeckers on burned Sierra Nevada forests. Ecosphere 2:1-17.
- Siegel, R. B., J. F. Saracco, and R. L. Wilkerson. 2010. Management indicator species (MIS) surveys on Sierra Nevada national forests: Black-backed Woodpecker. 2009 Annual Report. Report to USFS Pacific Southwest Region. The Institute for Bird Populations, Point Reyes Station, CA.
- Siegel, R. B., M. W. Tingley, and R. L. Wilkerson. 2011. Black-backed Woodpecker MIS surveys on Sierra Nevada National Forests: 2010 annual report. Report to USFS Pacific Southwest Region. The Institute for Bird Populations, Point Reyes Station, CA.
- Siegel, R. B., M. W. Tingley, and R. L. Wilkerson. 2012. Black-backed Woodpecker MIS surveys on Sierra Nevada National Forests: 2011 annual report. Report to USFS Pacific Southwest Region. The Institute for Bird Populations, Point Reyes Station, CA.
- Siegel, R. B., M. W. Tingley, and R. L. Wilkerson. 2014. Black-backed Woodpecker MIS Surveys on Sierra Nevada National Forests: 2012 Annual Report. Report to USFS Pacific Southwest Region. The Institute for Bird Populations, Point Reyes Station, CA.

- Siegel, R. B., R. L. Wilkerson, and D. L. Mauer. 2008. Black-backed Woodpecker (*Picoides arcticus*) surveys on Sierra Nevada national forests: 2008 pilot study. Report to Forest Service Region 5. The Institute for Bird Populations, Point Reyes Station, CA.
- Smucker, K. M., R. L. Hutto, and B. M. Steele. 2005. Changes in bird abundance after wildfire: importance of fire severity and time since fire. Ecological Applications 15:1535-1549.
- USDA Forest Service. 2007a. Sierra Nevada forest management indicator species amendment. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region.
- USDA Forest Service. 2007b. Sierra Nevada forests management indicator species: amendment FEIS. R5-MB-159. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region.
- Villard, P. 1994. Foraging behavior of Black-backed and Hairy Woodpeckers during spring and summer in a Canadian boreal forest. Canadian Journal of Zoology 72:1957-1959.
- Villard, P., and C. W. Beninger. 1993. Foraging behavior of male Black-backed and Hairy Woodpeckers in a forest burn. Journal of Field Ornithology 64:71-76.

Appendix I.

List of all non-aquatic bird species identified during Black-backed Woodpecker passive surveys.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Family
Mountain Quail	Oreortyx pictus	Odontophoridae
California Quail	Callipepla californica	Odontophoridae
Sooty Grouse	Dendragapus fuliginosus	Phasianidae
Turkey Vulture	Cathartes aura	Cathartidae
Osprey	Pandion haliaetus	Pandionidae
Sharp-shinned Hawk	Accipiter striatus	Accipitridae
Northern Goshawk	Accipiter gentilis	Accipitridae
Red-tailed Hawk	Buteo jamaicensis	Accipitridae
American Kestrel	Falco sparverius	Falconidae
Peregrine Falcon	Falco peregrinus	Falconidae
Killdeer	Charadrius vociferus	Charadriidae
Band-tailed Pigeon	Patagioenas fasciata	Columbidae
Mourning Dove	Zenaida macroura	Columbidae
Western Screech-Owl	Megascops kennicottii	Strigidae
Great Horned Owl	Bubo virginianus	Strigidae
Northern Pygmy-Owl	Glaucidium gnoma	Strigidae
Common Nighthawk	Chordeiles minor	Caprimulgidae
Common Poorwill	Phalaenoptilus nuttallii	Caprimulgidae
White-throated Swift	Aeronautes saxatalis	Apodidae
Anna's Hummingbird	Calypte anna	Trochilidae
Costa's Hummingbird	Calypte costae	Trochilidae
Calliope Hummingbird	Stellula calliope	Trochilidae
Rufous Hummingbird	Selasphorus rufus	Trochilidae
Lewis's Woodpecker	Melanerpes lewis	Picidae
Acorn Woodpecker	Melanerpes formicivorus	Picidae
Williamson's Sapsucker	Sphyrapicus thyroideus	Picidae
Red-breasted Sapsucker	Sphyrapicus ruber	Picidae
Downy Woodpecker	Picoides pubescens	Picidae
Hairy Woodpecker	Picoides villosus	Picidae
White-headed Woodpecker	Picoides albolarvatus	Picidae
Black-backed Woodpecker	Picoides arcticus	Picidae
Northern Flicker	Colaptes auratus	Picidae
Pileated Woodpecker	Dryocopus pileatus	Picidae
Olive-sided Flycatcher	Contopus cooperi	Tyrannidae
Western Wood-Pewee	Contopus sordidulus	Tyrannidae
Hammond's Flycatcher	Empidonax hammondii	Tyrannidae
Gray Flycatcher	Empidonax wrightii	Tyrannidae
Dusky Flycatcher	Empidonax oberholseri	Tyrannidae
Pacific-slope Flycatcher	Empidonax difficilis	Tyrannidae

Common Name	Scientific Name	Family	
Black Phoebe	Sayornis nigricans	Tyrannidae	
Ash-throated Flycatcher	Myiarchus cinerascens	Tyrannidae	
Western Kingbird	Tyrannus verticalis	Tyrannidae	
Cassin's Vireo	Vireo cassinii	Vireonidae	
Hutton's Vireo	Vireo huttoni	Vireonidae	
Warbling Vireo	Vireo gilvus	Vireonidae	
Gray Jay	Perisoreus canadensis	Corvidae	
Steller's Jay	Cyanocitta stelleri	Corvidae	
Western Scrub-Jay	Aphelocoma californica	Corvidae	
Pinyon Jay	Gymnorhinus cyanocephalus	Corvidae	
Black-billed Magpie	Pica hudsonia	Corvidae	
Clark's Nutcracker	Nucifraga columbiana	Corvidae	
American Crow	Corvus brachyrhynchos	Corvidae	
Common Raven	Corvus corax	Corvidae	
Purple Martin	Progne subis	Hirundinidae	
Tree Swallow	Tachycineta bicolor	Hirundinidae	
Violet-green Swallow	Tachycineta thalassina	Hirundinidae	
Cliff Swallow	Petrochelidon pyrrhonota	Hirundinidae	
Mountain Chickadee	Poecile gambeli	Paridae	
Chestnut-backed Chickadee	Poecile rufescens	Paridae	
Oak Titmouse	Baeolophus inornatus	Paridae	
Juniper Titmouse	Baeolophus ridgwayi	Paridae	
Bushtit	Psaltriparus minimus	Aegithalidae	
Red-breasted Nuthatch	Sitta canadensis	Sittidae	
White-breasted Nuthatch	Sitta carolinensis	Sittidae	
Pygmy Nuthatch	Sitta pygmaea	Sittidae	
Brown Creeper	Certhia americana	Certhiidae	
Rock Wren	Salpinctes obsoletus	Troglodytidae	
Canyon Wren	Catherpes mexicanus	Troglodytidae	
Bewick's Wren	Thryomanes bewickii	Troglodytidae	
House Wren	Troglodytes aedon	Troglodytidae	
Pacific Wren	Troglodytes pacificus	Troglodytidae	
Blue-gray Gnatcatcher	Polioptila caerulea	Polioptilidae	
American Dipper	Cinclus mexicanus	Cinclidae	
Golden-crowned Kinglet	Regulus satrapa	Regulidae	
Ruby-crowned Kinglet	Regulus calendula	Regulidae	
Western Bluebird	Sialia mexicana	Turdidae	
Mountain Bluebird	Sialia currucoides	Turdidae	
Townsend's Solitaire	Myadestes townsendi	Turdidae	
Hermit Thrush	Catharus guttatus	Turdidae	
American Robin	Turdus migratorius	Turdidae	
Wrentit	Chamaea fasciata	Timaliidae	

Common Name	Scientific Name	Family
European Starling	Sturnus vulgaris	Sturnidae
Cedar Waxwing	Bombycilla cedrorum	Bombycillidae
Orange-crowned Warbler	Oreothlypis celata	Parulidae
Nashville Warbler	Oreothlypis ruficapilla	Parulidae
Yellow Warbler	Setophaga petechia	Parulidae
Yellow-rumped Warbler	Setophaga coronata	Parulidae
Black-throated Gray Warbler	Setophaga nigrescens	Parulidae
Townsend's Warbler	Setophaga townsendi	Parulidae
Hermit Warbler	Setophaga occidentalis	Parulidae
MacGillivray's Warbler	Geothlypis tolmiei	Parulidae
Common Yellowthroat	Geothlypis trichas	Parulidae
Wilson's Warbler	Cardellina pusilla	Parulidae
Green-tailed Towhee	Pipilo chlorurus	Emberizidae
Spotted Towhee	Pipilo maculatus	Emberizidae
California Towhee	Melozone crissalis	Emberizidae
Chipping Sparrow	Spizella passerina	Emberizidae
Brewer's Sparrow	Spizella breweri	Emberizidae
Black-chinned Sparrow	Spizella atrogularis	Emberizidae
Vesper Sparrow	Pooecetes gramineus	Emberizidae
Lark Sparrow	Chondestes grammacus	Emberizidae
Black-throated Sparrow	Amphispiza bilineata	Emberizidae
Sage Sparrow	Amphispiza belli	Emberizidae
Fox Sparrow	Passerella iliaca	Emberizidae
Song Sparrow	Melospiza melodia	Emberizidae
Lincoln's Sparrow	Melospiza lincolnii	Emberizidae
White-crowned Sparrow	Zonotrichia leucophrys	Emberizidae
Dark-Eyed Junco	Junco hyemalis	Emberizidae
Western Tanager	Piranga ludoviciana	Cardinalidae
Black-headed Grosbeak	Pheucticus melanocephalus	Cardinalidae
Lazuli Bunting	Passerina amoena	Cardinalidae
Red-winged Blackbird	Agelaius phoeniceus	Icteridae
Western Meadowlark	Sturnella neglecta	Icteridae
Brewer's Blackbird	Euphagus cyanocephalus	Icteridae
Brown-headed Cowbird	Molothrus ater	Icteridae
Bullock's Oriole	Icterus bullockii	Icteridae
Purple Finch	Carpodacus purpureus	Fringillidae
Cassin's Finch	Carpodacus cassinii	Fringillidae
House Finch	Carpodacus mexicanus	Fringillidae
Red Crossbill	Loxia curvirostra	Fringillidae
Pine Siskin	Spinus pinus	Fringillidae
Lesser Goldfinch	Spinus psaltria	Fringillidae
Lawrence's Goldfinch	Spinus lawrencei	Fringillidae

Common Name	Scientific Name	Family
American Goldfinch	Spinus tristis	Fringillidae
Evening Grosbeak	Coccothraustes vespertinus	Fringillidae