



2020 MINNESOTA SPRUCE GROUSE SURVEY

Charlotte Roy, John Giudice, Chris Scharenbroich
Forest Wildlife Populations and Research Group
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
Grand Rapids, Minnesota
1 September 2020

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MNDNR) initiated the first annual spruce grouse (*Falci pennis canadensis*) survey in 2018 with the help of dozens of cooperators and citizen volunteers. In the second year of the survey, we invested additional effort to determine sources of variation in fecal pellet detection through repeat surveys. We were going to repeat this effort in 2020, but the COVID-19 pandemic prevented us from completing as many repeat surveys as planned. Participants surveyed for spruce grouse pellets at 273 sites in 2018, 314 sites in 2019, and 241 sites in 2020. Spruce grouse pellets were detected at 79 sites in 2018 (proportional use = 0.29; 95% confidence interval (CI): 0.24–0.34), 87 sites in 2019 (0.28; 95% CI: 0.24–0.34), and 81 sites in 2020 (0.33; 95% CI: 0.28–0.40). Participants counted a mean of 15.2 (95% CI: 8.8–21.6), 22.0 (95% CI: 14.7–29.3), and 21.2 (95% CI: 14.5–27.9) pellet groups at used sites in 2018, 2019, and 2020, respectively. Based on our updated Bayesian multi-season occupancy model, the estimated mean detection probability during initial visits was 0.35 (95% credible interval (CRI): 0.29–0.42) in 2018, 0.36 (95% CRI: 0.31–0.43) in 2019, and 0.43 (95% CRI: 0.35–0.53) in 2020. However, the slightly higher mean detection probability in 2020 may partly reflect the limited and clustered distribution of repeat surveys completed due to the pandemic. This is important because if annual variation in detection probability was large, then we would likely need to consider conducting revisit surveys each year, or at least periodically. When adjusted for probability of detection, the estimated probability of initial site use was 0.77 (95% CRI: 0.66–0.83) in 2018, 0.75 (95% CRI: 0.66–0.86) in 2019, and 0.70 (95% CRI: 0.56–0.81) in 2020. We also found very little turnover in site use between years, e.g., the probability of a site changing status between years was 0.12 (95% CRI: 0.05–0.21) in 2018–2019 and 0.08 (95% CRI: 0.01–0.19) in 2019–2020. Thus, based on the 3-year dataset, the spruce grouse population appeared to be stable or possibly decreasing slightly (mean finite rate of change = 0.98 [95% CRI: 0.86–1.14] in 2018–2019 and 0.93 [95% CRI: 0.78–1.04] in 2019–2020, where a value of 1 denotes a stable population, >1 indicates an increasing population, and <1 indicates a decreasing population). Citizen volunteers will be important contributors to refining the survey and conducting surveys in areas where agency staffing levels limit cooperator ability to complete routes. This survey is expected to be able to detect meaningful changes in the population over a 10-year period (e.g., a $\geq 15\%$ decline).

INTRODUCTION

Spruce grouse, *Falci pennis canadensis*, are a conifer-dependent gamebird in Minnesota and are expected to experience a range contraction due to climate change-induced habitat loss (Scheller and Mladenoff 2005, Prasad et al. 2007, Iverson et al. 2008). Thus, spruce grouse will likely have a more limited distribution in the southern portions of their range, which includes the

Great Lakes region, in the future. Minnesota is unique among the Great Lakes states in that it still permits spruce grouse hunting, although they are a Species of Greatest Conservation Need because they are vulnerable to decline (Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, MNDNR 2015). The spruce grouse is considered a Species of Special Concern in Michigan (Michigan DNR 2005) and was listed as threatened in Wisconsin in 1997 (Wisconsin DNR 2004). Yet, the only data the MNDNR collected on spruce grouse before 2018 was estimated total harvest as part of the annual Small Game Harvest Mail Survey (Dexter 2016). Estimated total harvest of spruce grouse has been 10,000–27,000 birds/year since 2006 (Dexter 2016). However, variation in spruce grouse harvest among years may be more reflective of the number of ruffed grouse (*Bonasa umbellus*) hunters; thus these harvest data cannot be used as a population index for spruce grouse (Gregg et al. 2004).

During 2014–2017, we developed survey methodology to provide an index of the spruce grouse population (Roy et al. 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2020). We evaluated an auditory survey using playback of female cantus calls (Roy et al. 2020), which is the most common approach to survey spruce grouse (Fritz 1979, Boag and McKinnon 1982, Schroeder and Boag 1989, Whitcomb et al. 1996, Lycke et al. 2011), and also evaluated a fecal pellet survey (Roy et al. 2020) as a means to monitor the population. Fecal pellets are easily detected in late winter/early spring as the snow pack dissipates and pellets that have been deposited and frozen during winter become visible on the snow surface, indicating spruce grouse use of forest stands. The pellet survey was more efficient and had higher detection rates than the auditory survey. We also found road effects to be negligible in high-use cover types (e.g., jack pine (*Pinus banksiana*) and black spruce (*Picea mariana*)). Thus, we designed a monitoring program based on a survey of sites centered on road-based points (hereafter, survey “sites”) in spruce grouse cover types dispersed across their range in Minnesota.

In 2018, MNDNR launched the annual spruce grouse pellet survey with the cooperation of biologists from the Chippewa National Forest, Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, Superior National Forest, 1854 Treaty Authority, Vermilion Community College, and dozens of citizen volunteers. This survey is expected to be able to detect meaningful changes in the population over a 10-year period (e.g., $\geq 15\%$ decline) and is intended to provide population information (i.e., status and distribution) that can be used to make management decisions.

METHODS

The pellet survey is comprised of 67 survey routes with 4-5 road-based sites per route spaced ≥ 400 m apart. Each route has ≥ 1 point with $\geq 30\%$ black spruce or jack pine habitat. Observers use a Global Positioning System (GPS) to walk a circular transect with a 100-m radius (i.e., 628-m length) centered on roadside sampling points. Observers record single grouse pellets and roost piles ≤ 1 m on either side of transects. Multiple pellets within a 30-cm diameter circle are considered a “roost” for the purpose of this survey. This standardization of the method is necessary because spruce grouse often roost in trees during winter and pellets fall to the ground in poorly defined roost piles. Ruffed grouse pellets are distinguished from spruce grouse pellets on the basis of length, thickness, uric acid wash, and color. Ruffed grouse pellets tend to be shorter, thicker, and usually have a uric acid wash, whereas spruce grouse pellets are longer, thinner, and infrequently have a uric acid wash. Spruce grouse pellets are also darker green in color when spruce grouse are consuming conifer needles (during winter), but color changes depend on diet; spruce grouse pellets can have a similar color to ruffed grouse pellets later in the spring. At each site observers also record covariate data for detection of grouse pellets, including the proportion of the 628-m transect that is located in spruce grouse cover types; days since last snow fall; whether snow cover is complete, partial, or gone; and survey conditions on a scale of 0-10 with 10 being the best conditions to detect pellets. Surveys

are repeated up to 5 times at a subset of sites (where seasonal technicians and/or volunteers were available) to allow modeling of the detection process and to help determine whether repeat visits will be necessary to account for annual variation in the detection process.

Beginning in 2020, we standardized our Bayesian model structure (Kéry and Schaub 2012, Su and Yajima 2015) based on what we learned in 2018–2019. That is, we did not conduct an exhaustive variable-selection exercise in 2020. Our model contained the following parameters for the initial state (in year 1): an indicator variable for the presence of jack pine and/or black spruce, the proportion of the transect that went through spruce grouse habitat (in year 1), and a random effect for the geographic clustering of sites into routes. For the observation process, we included covariates for survey conditions (1-10, with 10 being very good), visit, year, and a random effect for route. We did not attempt to use covariates to model transition probabilities, although we did allow them to vary annually. We computed 95% credible intervals (CRI) around estimates.

The COVID-19 pandemic affected spruce grouse surveys in 2020. Surveys are usually conducted during March, April, and the first part of May to coincide with the timing of snowmelt, such that some snow is still on the ground but melting and exposing pellets deposited during the winter. Governor Walz issued Executive Orders 20-20 and 20-33, which restricted nonessential field work by state employees and volunteers during 27 March – 4 May. The Governor issued Executive Order 20-48 on 4 May, which allowed field research and monitoring to resume. The MNDNR Commissioner approved some Wildlife Staff to conduct spruce grouse surveys beginning 20 May, but survey conditions were suitable only in the most northern portions of the survey region in late May and few surveys were conducted after 20 May.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

In 2020, 53 of 67 routes (median 5 points per route, range: 2–5) were surveyed by 20 cooperating biologists, 6 citizen volunteers, and 2 seasonal technicians between 3 March and 3 June (Table 1, Figure 1). Spring 2020 was generally warmer with less snow than the previous 2 years. Because of the pandemic, fewer revisit surveys were conducted in 2020 ($n = 112$; 46% of sites were visited 2-3 times) and revisits were mostly in the western portion of the survey region. Observers detected spruce grouse pellets at 67 (26%) of 241 survey sites during the initial visit and at 31 additional sites in revisit surveys. On average 15.1 (range: 1–119) spruce grouse single pellets and roosts were detected in initial visits. Similarly, ruffed grouse pellets and roosts were detected at 139 (58%) sites in initial visits with a mean count of 5.6 (range: 1–33) pellets per used site. Observers detected pellets of both species at only 38 sites (16%) in 2020, whereas pellets of neither species were detected at 78 sites (32%). This is similar to concordance rates observed in 2019 (14% and 29%, respectively).

The overall probability of spruce grouse site use, adjusted for imperfect detection, was 0.77 (95% CRI: 0.66–0.86) in 2018, 0.75 (95% CRI: 0.66–0.83) in 2019, and 0.70 (95% CRI: 0.56–0.81) in 2020 (Figure 2). When survey sites were grouped by ecological section, the Northern Minnesota and Ontario Peatlands had the highest probability of site use (mean annual estimate = 0.82), followed by the Northern Superior Uplands (0.75), and the Northern Minnesota Drift & Lake Plains (0.52). The latter seems high given naïve occupancy was <3% in 2019 & 2020; it may be an artifact of small sample sizes, minimal revisit surveys, and how our multi-season model is structured. The estimated mean finite rate of population change, meaning the ratio of future to current population size, was 0.98 (95% CRI: 0.86–1.14) during 2018–2019 and 0.93 (95% CRI: 0.78–0.98) during 2019–2020, indicating a stable population or one that might be declining very slowly (Figure 3). We need more years of data to resolve this.

Our 2020 naïve estimate of spruce grouse use (the proportion of sites where ≥ 1 pellet was detected in the initial survey) was much lower (0.35) than our model-based estimate of site use (0.70) and was consistent with previous analyses. This difference is the result of imperfect detection (i.e., many of the sites classified as “unused” after the initial survey probably had

pellets that were present but not detected). If the conditional probability (i.e., given a site was truly used) of detecting ≥ 1 pellet was close to 1, then a naïve estimate of site use based on a single-visit survey would be sufficient for monitoring spruce grouse populations and their distribution. However, if the mean conditional probability of detection is relatively low and the detection process varies greatly over space or time, then a naïve estimate of site use might be misleading. We estimated the mean probability of detection for a single-visit survey as 0.35 (95% CRI: 0.29–0.42) in 2018, 0.36 (95% CRI: 0.31–0.43) in 2019, and 0.43 (95% CRI: 0.35–0.53) in 2020. This means that 57–65% of survey sites classified as “unused” in the initial survey may have had spruce grouse pellets present but they were missed (overlooked) or not available for detection (e.g., buried in the snow). Conducting 2 follow-up surveys for a total of 3 visits improved the conditional probability of detection to 0.61–0.71, which allows us to compute a better estimate of true site use. In other words, by finding additional pellets in subsequent visits (or not finding pellets at sites where they were detected previously), a correction factor can be applied to account for missed pellets and produce a more accurate estimate of true site use. Based on 2 years of data with repeat surveys, annual variation in the detection process appeared to be negligible (i.e., range = 0.35–0.43) relative to other sources of sampling variation. Thus, data collection next year will help verify that a single visit is sufficient to monitor the population.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special thanks to G. Mehmel and S. Laudenslager for their suggestion and support of survey development. Biologists at Grand Portage Band of Chippewa Indians, Red Lake Nation, 1854 Treaty Authority, Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, U.S. Forest Service, and MNDNR Wildlife provided valuable feedback on survey design and assisted with surveys. Special thanks to all the cooperators and volunteers that assisted with this survey, with special thanks to cooperators in the Superior National Forest and 1854 Treaty Authority who conducted additional surveys during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. Seasonal technicians that assisted with repeat surveys included L. Hause, A. Elliott, J. Bates, and N. Dotson. Citizen-scientist volunteers usually include D. Johnson, A. Swarts, R. Anderson, J. Bigelow, G. Larson, J. Keenan, J. Asfoor, C. Hagley, J. Elton Turbes, W. Fleischman, J. Riley, D. Beseman, A. Schayler, H. Ledeen, B. Rothauge, M. Littler, A. Mollin-Kling, M. Bendel, C. Stignani, K. Boettcher, E. Gdula, C. Jensen, G. Jensen, N. Malinowski, D. Kuder, M. Rothstein, D. Klett, J. Ridlbauer, A. Vinar, E. Berg, R. Berg, D. Elliott, A. Krulc, A. Sporre, R. Langerud, N. Scheffler, M. Gabrys, and S. Anderson. However, during the pandemic, citizen-scientist volunteers could not conduct surveys. L. Gilbert assisted with paperwork for volunteers and logistics. L. Shartell and M. Carstensen reviewed this report. This work was funded through the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act.

LITERATURE CITED

- Boag, D. A., and D. T. McKinnon. 1982. Spruce grouse. Pages 61-62 in D.E. Davis, ed. Handbook of census methods for terrestrial vertebrates. CRC Press, Inc., Boca Raton, Florida.
- Dexter, M. 2017. 2016 Small game hunter mail survey. [2016 Small Game Harvest Survey](#)
- Fritz, R. S. 1979. Consequences of insular population structure: distribution and extinction of spruce grouse populations. *Oecologia* 42:57-65.
- Gregg, L., B. Heeringa, and D. Eklund. 2004. Conservation assessment for spruce grouse (*Falci pennis canadensis*). U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Eastern Region. 33 pp.

- Iverson, L., A. Prasad, and S. Mathews. 2008. Modeling potential climate change impacts on trees of the northeastern United States. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* 13:517-540.
- Kéry, M., and M. Schaub. 2012. Bayesian population analysis using WinBUGS: a hierarchical perspective. Academic Press, San Diego, California, USA.
- Lycke, A., L. Imbeau, and P. Drapeau. 2011. Effects of commercial thinning on site occupancy and habitat use by spruce grouse in boreal Quebec. *Canadian Journal of Forestry Research* 41:501-508.
- Michigan Department of Natural Resources. 2005. Michigan's wildlife action plan SGCN status and species-specific issues. *Falciennis canadensis*. Last accessed July 24 2013.
- Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. 2005. Minnesota's Wildlife Action Plan 2015-2025. [Wildlife Action Plan 2015-2025](#) Last accessed 2 September 2020.
- Prasad, A. M., L. R. Iverson, S. Mathews, and M. Peters. 2007-ongoing. A climate change atlas for 134 forest tree species of the eastern United States. U.S. Forest Service Northern Research Station, Delaware, Ohio. <http://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/atlas/tree/> Last accessed 17 January 2017.
- Roy, C., M. Larson, and J. Giudice. 2014. Developing Survey Methodology for Spruce grouse: A Pilot Study. Pages 127-132 in Summary of Wildlife Research Findings 2013. <http://files.dnr.state.mn.us/publications/wildlife/research2013/forest.pdf#view=fit&page=ode=bookmarks>
- Roy, C., J. Giudice, and C. Scharenbroich. 2015. Monitoring spruce grouse in Minnesota: A Pilot Study (2014-2015). Pages 38-53 in Summary of Wildlife Research Findings 2014. <http://files.dnr.state.mn.us/publications/wildlife/research2014/forest.pdf#view=fit&page=ode=bookmarks>
- Roy, C., J. Giudice, and C. Scharenbroich. 2016. Monitoring spruce grouse in Minnesota: A Pilot study (2014-2016). Pages 69-92 in Summary of Wildlife Research Findings 2015. <https://files.dnr.state.mn.us/publications/wildlife/research2015/full.pdf#view=fit&page=ode=bookmarks>
- Roy, C., J. Giudice, and C. Scharenbroich. 2017. Monitoring spruce grouse in Minnesota: A Pilot study (2014-2017). Summary of Wildlife Research Findings 2016. [2016 Spruce Grouse Research Summary](#)
- Roy, C., J. Giudice, and C. Scharenbroich. 2020. Evaluation of cantus-call and pellet surveys for Spruce Grouse (*Falciennis Canadensis canace*) at the southern extent of their range. *Journal of Field Ornithology* 91:44-63.
- Scheller, R. M., and D. J. Mladenoff. 2005. A spatially interactive simulation of climate change, harvesting, wind, and tree species migration and projected changes to forest composition and biomass in northern Wisconsin, USA. *Global Change Biology* 11:307-321.

- Schroeder, M. A., and D. A. Boag. 1989. Evaluation of a density index for territorial male spruce grouse. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 53:475-478.
- Su, Y., and M. Yajima, 2015. R2jags: Using R to Run 'JAGS'. R package version 0.5-7. [CRAN.R project](#)
- Stevens, D. L., and A. R. Olsen. 2014. Spatially balanced sampling of natural resources. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 99(465):262-277.
- Whitcomb, S. D., F. A. Servello, and A. F. O'Connell, Jr. 1996. Patch occupancy and dispersal of spruce grouse on the edge of its range in Maine. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 74:1951-1955.
- Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. 2004. Wisconsin endangered and threatened species laws and list. [Wisconsin Endangered and Threatened Species List](#) Last accessed 24 July 2013.

Table 1. Spruce grouse (SPGR) routes and sites surveyed in northern Minnesota in 2020 by staff, cooperators, and volunteers, and detections of SPGR and ruffed grouse (RUGR) pellets (singles and roosts per used site) during initial visits. Citizen volunteers usually assist with surveys in most survey areas, but the COVID-19 pandemic interrupted volunteer efforts in 2020.

Cooperator Area	No. citizen volunteers	Routes	Sites surveyed	Proportion sites used by SPGR	Proportion sites used by RUGR
Aurora SNF ¹	1	3	14	0.00	0.93
Baudette DNR ²	0	3	14	0.14	0.43
Bemidji DNR	0	2	9	0.00	0.22
Chippewa NF ³	1	4	19	0.00	0.47
Cook SNF	0	4	20	0.15	0.65
Duluth DNR	0	2	9	0.00	0.78
Ely SNF	0	2	10	0.50	0.30
Grand Marais SNF	0	3	14	0.29	0.50
Grand Rapids DNR	0	1	4	0.00	0.75
I Falls DNR	0	3	13	0.15	0.23
Leech Lake Res.	0	2	7	0.00	0.29
Orr DNR	0	4	15	0.07	0.40
Red Lake Res.	0	2	9	0.00	0.89
Red Lake WMA	1	5	24	0.67	0.62
1854 Treaty Authority	0	4	20	0.80	0.65
Tofte SNF	1	5	22	0.46	0.54
Two Harbors DNR	1	3	13	0.08	0.92
Tower DNR	0	1	5	0.40	1.00
Total	0	53	241	0.26	0.58
Not Surveyed	32	15	77	--	--

¹SNF = Superior National Forest

²DNR = Minnesota Department of Natural Resources –Section of Wildlife

³Some volunteers worked in groups on the same route, and some volunteers did routes in >1 work area.




Figure 1. Distribution of sampling sites in northern Minnesota. Ecological Classification System sections included the Northern Minnesota and Ontario Peatlands (n = 85 sites) in the northwest, the Northern Superior Uplands (n = 188 sites) in the east, and the Northern Minnesota Drift and Lake Plains (n = 44 sites) in the southcentral survey region.




Figure 2. Estimated spruce grouse site use by Ecological Classification System section and across all sections in northern Minnesota during 2018–2020. Expected values are based on a hierarchical dynamic occupancy model and naive use is the proportion of sites where pellets were detected in the initial survey. Error bars denote 95% credible intervals.




Figure 3. Estimated finite rate of change in site use by spruce grouse in northern Minnesota during 2018–2020 based on a hierarchical dynamic occupancy model. Values below the dashed line denote a decrease in site use between years, whereas values above the line indicate an increase in site use between years. Error bars denote 95% credible intervals.