

**Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
State Wildlife Grant  
ANNUAL INTERIM PERFORMANCE REPORT**

**Grant Number:** T-1 **Segment Number:** 6  
**Project Number:** 15  
**Project Title:** Evaluating the effects of forest management on bird and vegetation communities  
**Project Duration:** July 1, 2004 – December 31, 2006  
**Report Period:** July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006  
**Report Due Date:** September 30, 2006  
**Partner:** U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

**Objectives:**

1. Monitor how bird densities, forest structure, and understory composition have changed since 1991-1993.
2. Compare bird densities, forest structure, and understory composition among treatments to test whether thinning or gapping helps enhance recruitment of birds, plants, or forest structural attributes that are characteristic of old-growth forests.
3. Test whether retention of old-growth trees in harvested stands helps hasten recruitment of birds and vegetation components that are characteristic of old-growth stand.

**Summary of Accomplishments**

The following accomplishments are related to Objective 1:

1. Four biologists spent approximately 150 hours during summer surveying birds and forest vegetation to monitor decadal trends.
2. Existing data from 1991-1992 on bird and plant communities were made available by Dominick DellaSala and his staff from the World Wildlife Fund in the spring of 2006.
3. We re-surveyed breeding bird communities using the original methods at 5 replicate study areas for each of 3 different treatments; old-growth, young-growth untreated, and young-growth thinned. Each study area included 5 points that were surveyed 3 times from 6–20 June. All points were also geo-referenced using GPS.
4. All data are currently being compiled and prepared for analysis and reporting.

No progress was made or planned to be made on Objectives 2 and 3 during this report period.

**Significant Deviations**

1. We had intended to resurvey 4 different treatments; the 3 described above (#1) and young-growth with canopy gaps (gapped herinafter). However, after revisiting the original gapped plots we found that most (60%) had been subsequently thinned and were no long suitable for study. We search for replacements but found that no gapped sites were available that met the original criteria in terms of location, stand size, year of harvest, and year of treatment. Resurveying the remaining 40% of the plots was considered but abandoned because the small sample of plots (10) would not provide sufficient samples for monitoring.

2. We could not find candidates from the FWS biotechnician register that were i) available for the short time-frame of sampling and ii) had adequate field experience. Thus we used personal service contracts to hire one qualified technician. This contract included hourly rates and travel expenses comparable to those included in the original proposal.
3. Considerable savings were incurred in this study in 2005 because lodging was provided by USDA Forest Service and vehicles and gas were provided by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Juneau Fish and Wildlife Field Office and the Denver Zoological Foundation. We will use the money left over from 2005 to fund the second field season in 2006.

**Actual Costs during this Report Period** (*personnel plus all operating expense totals*):

(Reported costs included ADF&G indirect calculated at 13.5%)

Federal (from ADF&G):	Partner (nonfederal share):
\$9,809	\$3,270

**Project Leader** (*or Report Contact Person*):

Steve Matsuoka,  
Alaska Landbird Coordinator  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Migratory Bird Management  
1011 E. Tudor Road, ms 201  
Anchorage, Alaska 99503 USA  
907-786-3672, 907-786-3641 (fax)  
steve\_matsuoka@fws.gov