ECOLOGY OF HARLEQUIN DUCKS IN NORTHERN IDAHO

by

E. Frances Cassirer and Craig R. Groves
Nongame and Endangered Wildlife Program
Bureau of Wildlife

Idaho Department of Fish and Game
600 S. Walnut, P.O. Box 25
Boise, ID 83707
Jerry M. Conley, Director

May 1994

Idaho Department of Fish and Game
The National Geographic Society
U.S. Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station, Boise, ID
Study No. 4202-1-7-2

ABSTRACT

We examined population dynamics, habitat use, and food habits of harlequin ducks (Histrionicus histrionicus) breeding in northern Idaho 1989 - 1992. During 1991 - 1992, the breeding population on 7 study streams remained stable at 15 - 17 pairs and a total of 40 adult ducks. Annual productivity 1990 - 1992 averaged 1.2 ducklings fledged/female and ranged from 0.7 ducklings to 1.4 ducklings fledged/female. Median hatching date was June 18 (range June 15 - July 1). Fledging occurred at 41 - 63 days ($\underline{X}$ = 49, $\underline{n}$ = 12 broods). Brood size at fledging averaged 3.33 ducklings, with an average duckling survival rate to fledging of 55% (range 47 - 65%). Harlequin ducks were most frequently observed in western redcedar/western hemlock forest (Thuja plicata/ Tsuga heterophyla), on swiftly flowing streams less than 10m wide with a cobble to boulder substrate. Most observations were in mature or old growth forested stands that had not been logged or had an unlogged buffer along the stream. Four nests were found, 2 on canyon walls, 1 in dense vegetation on an island, and 1 in a tree cavity. Broods used significantly smaller stream reaches than adults.

Selected streams used by harlequin ducks in northern Idaho, northwestern Montana, and northwestern Wyoming ($\underline{n}$ = 11) were significantly more alkaline ($\underline{X}$ = 58 m/L $CaCO_3$) than northern Idaho streams not used by harlequin ducks ($\underline{X}$ = 8 m/L $CaCO_3$, p = 0.04). Average productivity from 1990 - 1992 was negatively correlated to May, June, and July streamflows (June $\underline{n}$ = 2

watersheds, 3 years, r = -0.93; P = 0.006), and appeared to be independent of benthic macroinvertebrate biomass (n = 2 streams, 2 years; P = 0.41).

Two females radio-marked in Idaho were located in the San Juan and Gulf Islands in northwestern Washington and southwestern British Columbia in July and August. One band return was also received from northwestern Washington. Return rates of marked adults to northern Idaho averaged 63%, with 89% of ducks that returned once returning in successive years. Nearly all birds returned to the same stream, and return rates were the same for males and females. Some pairs maintained multi-year pair bonds. None of 27 ducklings banded 1988 - 1992 have been reobserved in Idaho.

Continued inventory and monitoring of harlequin ducks in northern Idaho is essential for establishing baseline data and assessing effects of management actions. Timing is critical for success of an inventory or monitoring effort. In northern Idaho, pair surveys should be conducted between April 25 and May 25. Brood surveys should be conducted between July 15 and August 5. Recommended methodology and areas for inventory and monitoring are included.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS, cont'd.

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

INTRODUCTION

Harlequin ducks are sea ducks that breed inland on swiftly flowing mountain streams. In North America, this holarctic species occurs in disjunct populations associated with the Pacific and Atlantic coasts. The Pacific breeding range extends through Alaska, British Columbia, Washington, Oregon, inland to the Yukon and Northwest territories, Alberta, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming.

The harlequin is a category 2 candidate for listing throughout its range in the United States and is listed as an endangered species in eastern Canada (Cassirer et al. 1993a). Little information is available range-wide on habitat use, population dynamics, or abundance. In 1987, surveys were initiated in Idaho to examine distribution and size of the breeding population. By 1990, harlequins had been found on 38 streams in northern, north-central, and southeastern Idaho. The breeding population was estimated at 100 birds or less (Cassirer et al. 1991).

This study was initiated in 1991 to better define population dynamics and habitat use, to investigate factors affecting density and productivity, and to develop inventory and monitoring protocols for harlequin ducks in northern Idaho. Separate sections of this report examine population ecology, habitat use, food habits, and factors potentially affecting productivity. The last section is an inventory and monitoring protocol for northern Idaho.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many thanks to field assistants R.N. Anderson, J.B. Bright, M.R. Robertson, and M.J. Ulliman. Thanks also to personnel at the Priest Lake Ranger District, Idaho Panhandle National Forests and the Coeur d'Alene and Lewiston offices of the Idaho Department of Fish and Game for providing equipment, accommodations, and information. P. Harrington generously provided office space and a vehicle out of the Idaho Panhandle National Forests supervisor's office. Washington Department of Wildlife biologist G. Schirato was instrumental in assisting with coastal radio-tracking. V. Saab facilitated funding through the U.S. Forest Service Intermountain Research Station. This project was funded by grants from the U.S. Forest Service Intermountain Research Station and the National Geographic Society.

STUDY AREA

This study was conducted on northern Idaho streams in the Priest Lake, Upper Priest Lake, and southeastern Lake Pend Oreille watersheds. These areas are primarily managed by the Priest Lake and Sandpoint Ranger Districts on the Idaho Panhandle National Forests, and the Idaho Department of Lands. A small amount of the area is in private ownership. Harlequin duck ecology was studied on 4 streams at Priest and Upper Priest Lakes: Upper Priest River, Hughes Fork, Gold Creek, and Granite Creek, and 3 streams at Lake Pend Oreille: Granite, North Gold and Gold Creeks. About 30-40% of Idaho's known harlequin duck

population breeds on these streams (Cassirer and Groves 1990).

An additional 9 streams in the Priest Lake watershed: South Fork Granite, Blacktail, Tillicum, Willow, Beaver, Caribou, Lion, Two Mouth, and Soldier Creeks, and 3 streams at Lake Pend Oreille: Johnson, Cedar, and North Twin Creeks, were also surveyed at least once during the study. Habitat and invertebrate data were collected on these streams, but no harlequin ducks were observed.

POPULATION ECOLOGY

Methods

Stream Surveys.--Harlequin duck numbers and productivity were estimated from repeated surveys of the study area streams. In 1991, Gold and Granite Creeks on Lake Pend Oreille were surveyed weekly starting April 19; 1992 surveys on all streams were conducted every 10 - 14 days starting March 16. Surveys continued until the end of August or for 2 weeks after the last ducks were observed, whichever was later. Additional information is included from similar surveys conducted in 1989 and 1990.

Stream surveys consisted of walking in or along the stream with 8 or 10 power binoculars and looking for ducks. Ducklings were classified by plumage development categorized into 3 classes and 7 subclasses; from class IA downy, no feathers visible, to class III, fully feathered (Gollop and Marshall 1954).

Trapping, Marking, and Radiotelemetry.--Return rates, migration, and nesting information were collected from banded,

nasal- and radio-marked harlequin ducks. Harlequin ducks were trapped from 1988 to 1992 by flushing them into 10-cm mesh mist nets set up across the stream. Adults were trapped with a single net stretched between poles on either bank. Ducklings were sometimes able to break through a single net when several were trapped in a group, so a double net was used for trapping broods.

All ducks were legbanded with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) bands. Adults were also individually marked with colored nylon nasal disks and juveniles either nasal-marked or color leg-banded through 1991. In 1992, colored legbands were used on both adults and juveniles.

Nine females were also radiomarked in the spring before and during incubation (1991 $\underline{n}$ = 4, 1992 $\underline{n}$ = 5), and 7 females were radioed in the summer just prior to migration (1991 $\underline{n}$ = 4, 1992 $\underline{n}$ = 3). We used Holohil PD-2 (Holohil Systems Ltd., Ontario, Canada) and ATS (Advanced Telemetry Systems, Inc., Isanti, MN) transmitters. Transmitters were either attached to the base of the tail feathers with a plastic tie, or sutured behind the nape with two stitches of 3/0 nonabsorbable suture material.

Results and Discussion

Harlequin Duck Numbers.--Total number of adults on the 7 study streams was estimated at 40 in both 1991 and 1992. In 1991, 15 pairs and 10 unpaired drakes were observed and in 1992, 17 pairs and 6 unpaired drakes were observed. No unpaired females were observed either year. Sex ratio of males to females

was 1.7:1 (64% males) in 1991 and 1.3:1 (55% males) in 1992. Numbers appear to have remained fairly stable since 1990, with an average of 2 or 3 pairs and 1 or 2 unpaired males per stream (Table 1).

Duckling Development.--Twelve broods were followed from hatching or class I in 1991 and 1992. Plumage development was variable among broods. In general, feathers were first visible (Class II), at 2 to 3 weeks, ducklings were fully feathered (Class III) at 5 to 6 weeks, and fledging was observed at 6 to 7 weeks. However, some ducklings were 7-weeks of age before reaching Class III and did not fledge until 9 weeks (Table 2). Fledged ducklings were as large or larger than the hen and nearly indistinguishable from an adult female in the field. In the hand, ducklings had lighter legs and feet than the hen (yellowish vs. gray), shorter wings, a darker bill with no light callous on the end and a darker face, particularly the light patch next to the bill. Overall, ducklings were slightly browner. The white dot near the ear was just as bright in ducklings as the hen. Ducklings also had new rounded tail feathers, whereas tail feathers on the hen had worn, pointed tips.

Duckling Survival.--In 1991, duckling survival from hatching or class IA to fledging averaged 65%. Survival in 1992 dropped to 47%. On average, about half the ducklings reached fledging from hatching or class IA in 1991 and 1992 (Table 3). Over half the mortality occurred during the first 3 weeks, but duckling mortality continued throughout the breeding season to

Table 1. Adult harlequin duck numbers on 7 streams in northern Idaho, 1989 - 1992.

Stream	1989		1990		1991		1992		Average	
	Pairs	Unpaired males	Pairs	Unpaired males	Pairs	Unpaired males	Pairs	Unpaired males	Pairs	Unpaired males
Granite Cr., L.Pend Oreille	na[1]	na	na	na	2	3	1	2	1.5	2.5
Gold and N. Gold Cr., L. Pend Oreille	na	na	2	0	4	0	4	1	3.3	0.3
Granite Cr., Priest Lake	3	2	2	1	1	2	3	2	2.25	1.75
Gold Cr., Priest Lake	na	na	2	1	2	2	4	0	2.6	1
Upper Priest River	na	na	4	2	2	2	3	0	3	2.7
Hughes Fork	na	na	5	1	4	1	2	1	3.3	1
Total					15	10	17	6	16	8.0

[1] na = data not available.

Table 2. Development in 12 harlequin duck broods on 7 streams in northern Idaho, 1991 - 1992.

	Hatch date	Age in days at class						
		IA (6)[b]	IB (5)	IC (9)	IIA (5)	IIB-C (9)	III (6)	Fledged (8)
Range	6/15 - 7/1	1 - 4	4 - 8	8 - 21	15 - 28	21 - 49	25 - 51	41 - 63
Median	6/18	2	7	9	21	28	43	49
Estimated average[a]		1 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 25	26 - 35	36 - 41	42 - 51

[a] Best estimate for aging harlequin ducklings in the field.

[b] Number of broods observed.

Table 3. Percent survival of harlequin ducklings on 7 streams in northern Idaho, 1991 - 1992.

	initial brood size	Survival rate						$\bar{x}$ brood size at fledging
		2 weeks	3 weeks	4 weeks	5 weeks	6 weeks	Fledging	
1991 (4 broods)	4.25	0.88	0.88	0.76	0.76	0.65	0.65	3.67
1992 (8 broods)	5.38	0.82	0.65	0.62	0.61	0.53	0.47	3.14
Average 1991 -1992	5.00	0.84	0.73	0.68	0.66	0.57	0.55	3.33

fledging. Average brood size at hatching or class IA was 5. Each year, 1 brood did not have any ducklings that reached fledging. Average size of the 10 broods that reached fledging was 3.33 (Table 3).

From 1990 - 1992, productivity on the 6 study streams averaged 1.2 ducklings fledged per female, or an average of 10.5 ducklings fledged per year. Productivity was highly variable among years, ranging from 0.7 ducklings per female in 1991 to 1.4 ducklings per female in 1990 (Table 4). Average productivity was slightly higher at Lake Pend Oreille than in the Upper Priest River watershed, however this difference was not significant.

Breeding Chronology.--In 1992, the only year surveys began before ducks arrived on the breeding streams, the first harlequin duck observed was a lone male, April 1 on Upper Priest River. The first pair was observed April 20, on Granite Creek at Lake Pend Oreille. Males left breeding streams significantly earlier in 1992 ($\underline{X}$ = May 18) than in 1991 ($\underline{X}$ = June 10, $\underline{P}$ = 0.03). Ducklings were observed from June until early September both years (Table 5) and median estimated hatching date, June 18 did not differ among years (1991 $\underline{n}$ = 4, 1992 $\underline{n}$ = 8; $\underline{P}$ = 0.09) or between Lake Pend Oreille ($\underline{n}$ = 5) and Priest Lake streams ($\underline{n}$ = 7, $\underline{P}$ = 0.09).

Survey Accuracy.--Estimates of the maximum number of pairs using a stream in a given year were made by summing all marked pairs observed on the stream during the season with the maximum number of unmarked pairs. During pair surveys in both years, 23

Table 4. Productivity of harlequin ducks on 7 streams in northern Idaho, 1990 - 1992.

Stream	1990		1991		1992		All years	
	Total ducklings fledged	$\bar{x}$ ducklings fledged/female	Total ducklings fledged	$\bar{x}$ ducklings fledged/female	Total ducklings fledged	$\bar{x}$ ducklings fledged/female	$\bar{x}$ ducklings fledged	$\bar{x}$ (SE) ducklings fledged/female
Upper Priest River watershed (3 streams)	–[a]	1.0	8	1.0	13	1.4	10.5[b]	1.1 (0.13)
N. Fork Granite Creek (Priest Lake)	3	1.5	0	0	0	0	1.0	0.5 (0.50)
Lake Pend Oreille watershed (3 streams)	–[a]	1.5	3	0.5	9	1.8	6[b]	1.3 (0.39)
All streams	–[a]	1.4 (0.26)	11	0.7 (0.46)	22	1.3 (0.49)	16.5	1.2 (0.23)

[a] Not all streams were surveyed in 1990.

[b] Average number of ducklings fledged in 1991 and 1992.

Table 5. Chronology of harlequin duck observations on 7 streams in northern Idaho, 1991 - 1992.

Observation	1991		1992	
	Date	Stream	Date	Stream
First adult	na[1]	na	4/1	Upper Priest River
First pair	na	na	4/20	Granite Creek, PDO
First duckling	6/27	Gold Creek, PL	6/19	Gold Creek, PDO
Last pair	6/26	Gold Creek, PDO	6/8	Upper Priest River
Last male	6/26	Granite Creek, PDO	6/8	Upper Priest River
Last female without a brood	8/1	Gold Creek, PDO	7/20	Granite Creek, PL
Last duckling	9/9	Hughes Fork	9/2	Upper Priest River

[1] na = data not available.

(58%) of the estimated 40 adult harlequin ducks on the survey area were marked. Although observation rates on a single stream survey varied from 0 to 100%, accuracy of pair estimates from a single survey averaged 63% between April 25 and June 5 (Table 6). On average, surveys conducted after June 5, and before April 25, revealed fewer than 25% of pairs using a stream. In 1991, surveys between April 25 and May 1 had the best accuracy (67%). In 1992, surveys between May 11 and May 24 were most accurate (76%).

The highest number of ducklings was observed during surveys conducted June 20 - July 3. However, due to duckling mortality and some late hatching dates, surveys between July 4 and mid-August actually provided a more accurate indication of the number of ducklings fledged (Table 6).

Table 6. Percent accuracy of harlequin duck surveys on 7 streams in northern Idaho, 1991 - 1992.

Dates	Males		Females without broods		Juveniles		Percent pairs observed			Percent juveniles fledged observed		
	1991	1992	1991	1992	1991	1992	1991	1992	x 1991-1992	1991	1992	x 1991-1992
3/16-3/29	na[1]	0	na	0	na	0	na	0	0	na	0	0
3/30-4/12	na	1	na	0	na	0	na	0	0	na	0	0
4/13-4/24	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	6	3	0	0	0
4/25-5/8	11	17	10	11	0	0	67	65	66	0	0	0
5/9-5/22	16	17	9	13	0	0	60	76	69	0	0	0
5/23-6/5	12	10	8	9	0	0	53	53	53	0	0	0
6/6-6/19	9	2	9	7	5	15	13	12	13	45	68	61
6/20-7/3	2	0	7	12	12	30	6	0	3	109	136	127
7/4-7/17	0	0	9	5	15	17	0	0	0	136	77	97
7/18-7/31	0	0	4	0	9	21	0	0	0	82	95	91
8/1-8/14	0	0	2	0	8	20	0	0	0	73	90	85
8/15-8/28	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	9	23	18
8/29-9/4	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	9	18	15
9/5-9/11	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	0	3
9/12-9/25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

[1] na = data not available.

Migration.--Two of 7 unsuccessful or nonbreeding females radiomarked on breeding streams in early July, were relocated on the Pacific coast in late July and early August. One hen originally marked on the Hughes Fork in May 1988 was radiomarked July 17, 1991 on Upper Priest River. She was aerially relocated July 30, 1991 off Battleship Island, Washington, a National Wildlife Refuge in the San Juan Islands. On July 31, a ground location revealed her to be alone and able to fly (not molting).

She returned to northern Idaho in 1992 and nested successfully on the Hughes Fork. She was again observed on Upper Priest River during the summer of 1993.

A female radiomarked on the North Fork of Granite Creek at Priest Lake July 8, 1992 was aerially relocated July 25 and July 31, 1992 off Halibut Island in the southern Gulf Islands, British Columbia. A ground location on August 2, 1992 revealed her to be in a group of 26 molting harlequins.

One band return was received from a juvenile male marked as a duckling on the Hughes Fork in 1991. This bird was shot off a scoter decoy at Oak Harbor, Washington, in October 1992. The duck was reported to be in breeding plumage in a group of 4 harlequin ducks.

Return Rates.--Thirty-nine adults (25 females and 14 males) were marked on the study area from 1988-1992 (Table 7, Appendix A). Of the 30 (19 females and 11 males) marked prior to 1992, 19 (63%) returned at least once. Return rates were equal for males and females. Of the 9 ducks that returned once and were followed for more than 2 years, 8 (89%) returned more than once. At least 1 duck marked in 1988 returned through 1993 (6 years).

Twenty-seven ducklings were marked from 1989 - 1991. None were reobserved on the streams during the study period.

Philopatry.--All ducks returned to the same area where they were marked. No exchange was observed between Lake Pend Oreille and Priest Lake, and no ducks marked at Granite Creek at Priest Lake returned to the Upper Priest River watershed during the

Table 7. Returns of marked harlequin ducks to northern Idaho breeding streams, 1988 - 1992.

ADULTS							
Year marked	Number returned				No. females marked	No. males marked	Total no. marked
	1989	1990	1991	1992			
1988	3	3	3	3	4	2	6
1989	_	4	4	4	7	4	11
1990	-	-	1	1	0	1	1
1991	-	-	-	10	8	4	12
1992	-	-	-	-	6	3	9
Total					25	14	39

spring breeding season. One marked female observed on Granite Creek at Priest Lake during 1991 and 1992 was trapped on Gold Creek at Priest Lake (Upper Priest River watershed) in July of 1992, evidently just prior to or during migration. One male marked in 1990 on Gold Creek at Lake Pend Oreille was observed on Granite Creek at Lake Pend Oreille in 1991 and 1992. Several ducks moved between Upper Priest River, the Hughes Fork, and Gold Creek throughout the breeding season.

Mate Fidelity.--Six pairs were individually marked together between 1988 and 1991. One pair was not reobserved in subsequent years, and the status of a second pair following marking could not be determined because the ducks were extreme wary and several drakes were present at the few observations of the female. Two pairs remained together; 1 pair originally marked in 1988 maintained their pair bond through the entire study (through

1992), the other pair was marked in 1991 and were paired again in 1992. In 2 cases only 1 individual from the pair returned in subsequent years. In 1 pair only the male returned, and in 1 only the female returned. The female returned mated with an unmarked male. The male returned as a bachelor drake for 2 years before pairing with an unmarked female.

HABITAT USE

The harlequin is the only duck in the northern hemisphere to nest almost exclusively along swiftly flowing mountain streams. Within their breeding range, harlequin ducks nest only along a select number of clear streams with rocky substrates. Streambank characteristics are highly variable, from moorland in Iceland (Bengtson 1972), spruce forest and willow thickets in Labrador, to coniferous forest in the Rocky Mountains (Cassirer et al. 1993a).

Methods

To quantify habitat use of harlequin ducks in northern Idaho, data on stream and streambank characteristics were collected whenever harlequin ducks were observed during systematic stream surveys 1990-1992. These data include observations on the Lochsa, St. Joe, Coeur d'Alene, and Moyie Rivers, and the East Fork of Lightning Creek in 1990 as well as on the study streams at Priest Lake and Lake Pend Oreille.

In 1991 and 1992, stream velocities were measured by

throwing a fishing bobber into the center of the stream current 3 times and averaging the length of time it took to travel 5m. Percent canopy cover was estimated by averaging 4 readings of a spherical densiometer at the edge of the stream. This represents the canopy cover on the streambank, not in the interior forest. Appendix B contains a sample data sheet with an explanation of habitat classifications.

Analysis of use was based on 250 adult observations, 80 brood observations and 4 nest locations. Habitat variables were compared with chi-square tests (Neu et al. 1974) and t-tests.

Results and Discussion

Adults and juveniles.--Adult and juvenile harlequin ducks in northern Idaho typically used streams with a cobble to boulder substrate in mature to old-growth western redcedar/western hemlock forest. Stream reaches used by harlequin ducks were usually away from roads or trails and were not logged or had an unlogged buffer along the stream. Most harlequin ducks were observed in streams 10 m or less in width; broods were observed in significantly smaller streams than adults (Table 8).

Brood habitat also differed significantly from adult habitat in several ways that could indicate selection for these characteristics or may simply reflect seasonal changes in the streams due to lower discharge at the time broods were using them. These include greater use of pocketwater and pool habitats, the presence of more loafing sites (Table 8), slower

Table 8. Comparison of habitats used by harlequin duck adults and broods (percent use) in northern Idaho, 1990 - 1992.

Classification	Adults (n = 250)	Broods (n = 80)
Stream habitat P = 0.000		
Riffle	20	21
Run	29	13
Rapid	25	17
Pocketwater	9	29
Pool/Backwater	17	21
Substrate p = 0.892		
Cobble	54	54
Boulder	20	22
Bedrock	4	2
Gravel/Sand/Silt	22	22
Bank composition p =0.732		
Trees	39	42
Shrubs	22	21
Mosaic	22	17
Grass/forb	7	7
Gravel/Sand/Silt/Bedrock	2	11
Woody Debris	1	2
Overstory age p = 0.018		
Old growth	20	20
Mature	58	45
Immature	16	18
Sapling/pole	3	18

Table 8 cont'd. Comparison of habitats used by harlequin duck adults and broods (percent use) in northern Idaho, 1990 - 1992.

Classification	Adults	Broods
n	(250)	(80)
Overstory species p = 0.018		
Cedar/Hemlock	82	84
Ponderosa Pine/ Douglas-fir	3	11
Spruce/Fir	13	1
Deciduous/Larch/ Lodgepole	2	4
Logging history p = 0.813		
None	90	91
Clearcut or selection harvest	10	9
Accessibility p = 0.343		
Over 50m from a road or trail	75	80
Less than 50m from a road or trail	25	20
Stream width (m) p = 0.001		
1 - 5	23	39
6 - 10	40	46
11 - 15	16	11
> 15	20	4
Channel type p = 0.436		
Straight	27	43
Curved	35	22
Meander/Braided	38	35

Table 8 cont'd. Comparison of habitats used by harlequin duck adults and broods (percent use) in northern Idaho, 1990 - 1992.

Classification n	Adults (250)	Broods (80)
Loafing sites/ 10m p = 0.000		
0	17	6
1	19	5
>1	64	88
Woody debris/ 10 m p = 0.608		
0	39	35
1	20	25
>1	41	40
Bank undercut p = 0.905		
Present	49	49
Absent	51	51
Vegetative overhang p = 0.239		
Present	61	53
Absent	39	47

average water velocities (Adults $\underline{X}$ = 1.20 m/sec, SD 0.577, $\underline{n}$ = 164; Broods $\underline{X}$ = 0.89 m/sec, SD 0.381 $\underline{n}$ = 64; $\underline{P}$ = 0.000), and warmer water temperatures (Adults X = 6.79 °C, SD 3.23, $\underline{n}$ = 75; Broods X = 9.35 °C, SD = 2.74, $\underline{n}$ = 24; $\underline{P}$ = 0.03).

Nests.--Four nests of 2 radiomarked females and 1 unmarked

female were located during the study. Two nests (same female) were located on canyon walls, 1 was located on the ground at the downstream end of an island, and 1 was in a ground level tree cavity (Cassirer et al. 1993b).

FOOD HABITS

Harlequin ducks eat almost entirely animal matter. During the breeding season they usually feed on insect larvae attached to rocks on the stream bottom. The harlequin bill has a hard edge and a pointed tip adapted to prying food from rocky substrate. Their habit of feeding on chitons and barnacles in the marine environment is an indication of their prowess at obtaining securely attached prey. Little work has been done on inland food habits, however there is no evidence of selection for any particular taxa of stream invertebrates (Bengtson and Ulfstrand 1971).

Harlequins will also feed on drifting material, on roe (Dzinbal 1982), and occasionally will take small fish. However, these foods are generally taken opportunistically and are usually secondary to their reliance on benthic material.

Methods

Benthic macroinvertebrate samples were collected on 5 streams used by harlequin ducks and 4 streams not used by harlequin ducks in early June of 1991. Samples were taken again in late June of 1991 and 1992 on the 2 streams where ducklings

were successfully produced in 1991.

All macroinvertebrate samples were collected using a 0.1-m^2 Hess sampler. Three samples were collected per site, and 2 sites were sampled per stream. Sites on streams used by harlequin ducks were located in riffles where harlequins were frequently observed, near the upstream and downstream edges of reaches of known use. After collection, samples were immediately transferred to jars and preserved in 90% ethyl alcohol.

Samples were hand-picked and separated into groups of lowest identifiable taxonomy. Ephemeropterans, Plecopterans, and Trichopterans were separated into size classes of less than or equal to 3 mm (nymphules) or greater than 3 mm. Nymphules had not yet developed the morphological characteristics necessary for positive taxonomic identification below the ordinal level. Organisms greater than 3 mm were identified to species where possible except Chironomidae which are extremely difficult to identify without staining. Chironomid larvae ranged from 2 mm to 8 mm in size with an estimated average size of 5 mm.

Abundance was determined by counting all individuals in each sample. Biomass was determined by placing the preserved specimens in an 80 ^{0}C oven and drying for 24 h to a constant weight. Dried specimens were weighed on an electronic balance to 0.01 g. Because cases constructed of inorganic material (e.g. caddis larvae cases) can contribute 83% to the dry weight of the organism (Collier 1991), all caddis larvae were removed from their cases before biomass estimates were calculated.

Water samples were collected at each site (2 per stream) in 1990 and 1991. Samples were placed in coolers on ice until delivered to the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare Water Quality lab for analysis of dissolved $CaCO_3$ and SO_4.

Harlequin duck feces were collected opportunistically from loafing sites. Feces were only collected when the duck was actually observed at the site. One stomach sample was collected from a trap mortality. Feces and stomach samples were preserved in 90% ethyl alcohol.

Diagnostic parts of sclerotized insect pieces in fecal samples were analyzed to family where possible. Other organic and inorganic material was also examined under a dissecting scope. Relative contribution of each taxonomic group and other organic material was visually estimated.

Results and Discussion

At least 33 taxa in 10 orders were represented in the benthic samples. The orders Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera, Trichoptera, and Diptera made up approximately 82% of all taxa encountered in the samples (Gustin 1993, Appendix C). Total standing crop was highly variable, both within and among streams. Average standing crop per stream ranged from 0.22 to 1.06 g/m^2 (Table 9). Average standing crop on streams used by harlequin ducks ($\underline{X}$ = 0.52 g/m^2, SD = 0.19, $\underline{n}$ = 5) was greater than that on streams not used by harlequin ducks ($\underline{X}$ = 0.34 g/m^2, SD = 0.13, $\underline{n}$ = 4) however this was not the case on all streams (Table 9) and

Table 9. Standing crop (g/m^2) of macroinvertebrates on 9 streams in northern Idaho, 1991 - 1992.

Stream	Harlequin Duck use	Date	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	min	max
Granite Cr., L. Pend Oreille	Y	7/15/92	1.06	0.18	0.93	1.19
Granite CR., L. Pend Oreille	Y	7/15/91	1.03	0.16	0.92	1.14
Granite Cr., L. Pend Oreille	Y	6/13/91	0.82	0.07	0.78	0.87
Gold Cr., Priest Lake	Y	7/13/92	0.55	0.01	0.54	0.56
Gold Cr., Priest Lake	Y	6/19/91	0.54	0.02	0.53	0.55
Beaver Creek	N	6/27/91	0.53	0.02	0.51	0.54
N. Fork Granite Cr.	Y	6/20/91	0.49	0.31	0.27	0.71
Hughes Fork	Y	6/19/91	0.46	0.03	0.44	0.48
Gold Cr., Priest Lake	Y	7/18/91	0.43	0.03	0.42	0.45
S. Fork Granite Cr.	N	6/27/91	0.31	0.06	0.26	0.35
Caribou Cr.	N	6/24/91	0.30	0.14	0.20	0.40
Gold Cr., L. Pend Oreille	Y	6/14/91	0.29	0.02	0.28	0.30
Lion Cr.	N	6/24/91	0.22	0.02	0.21	0.23

the difference was not significant ($P > 0.05$).

Water Chemistry.--Streams used by harlequin ducks in northern Idaho, western Montana, and northwestern Wyoming were significantly more alkaline ($\underline{X}$ $CaCO_3$ = 58 m/L, $\underline{n}$ = 11) than

northern Idaho streams not used by harlequin ducks ($\underline{X}$ $CaCo_3$ = 8 m/L, $\underline{n}$ = 4, $\underline{P}$ = 0.004) (Table 10).

Table 10. Alkalinity and sulfates (m/L) in streams in northern Idaho, northwestern Montana, and northwestern Wyoming sampled in 1990 - 1991.

Stream	Harlequin Duck use	Date	Alkalinity ($CaCo_3$)	Sulfate (SO_4)
Berry Cr., Grand Teton N.P.	Y	8/30/90	132	-
Gold Cr., L. Pend Oreille	Y	8/23/90	86	-
Gold Cr., L. Pend Oreille	Y	6/14/91	77	12
McDonald Cr., Glacier N.P.	Y	9/7/90	74	-
Hughes Fork	Y	6/20/91	62	< 5
Granite Cr., L. Pend Oreille	Y	6/13/91	58	< 5
Gold Creek, Priest Lake	Y	6/19/91	44	< 5
N. Fork Clearwater	Y	9/8/90	31	-
N. Fork Granite Cr.	Y	6/19/91	29	< 5
Lochsa River	Y	9/9/91	29	-
St. Joe River	Y	8/21/90	26	-
S. Fork Granite Cr.	N	6/27/91	19	-
Beaver Cr.	N	6/27/91	7	< 5
Caribou Cr.	N	6/24/91	3	< 5
Lion Cr.	N	6/24/91	3	< 5

Fecal Samples.--Harlequin duck fecal samples and stomach sample contained primarily Ephemeroptera (mayflies) and Trichoptera (caddisflies) (Table 11). Other organic material

Table 11. Percent composition of 17 harlequin duck fecal samples and 1 stomach sample collected on northern Idaho streams, 1991 - 1992.

Sample No.	Ephemeroptera	Trichoptera	Other Insects	Organic Matter	Inorganic matter
67	30[a]	45[d]	20 Plecoptera	5	Gravel
68	5[a]	90[d]	0	5	Gravel
69	5[a]	90[d]	0	5	None
70	5[b]	90[e]	0	cases[e] (5)	None
71	0	5[f]	85 Coleoptera	15 (Eggs 5)	None
72	70[a]	20[f]	0	10	None
73	10[a]	80[d]	0	10	Sand and Clay
74	5[a]	85[f]	5 Coleoptera	5	Sand and Clay
75	45[a,c]	45	0	10	Clay
76	90[a,c]	5	0	5	Gravel
77(Stomach)	80[a,c]	0	0	20 (near Elodea)	None
78	60[b]	30	0	10	Gravel
79	75[b]	20	0	5	None
92	90[a]	0	0	10 (Feather)	Gravel and Sand
93	90[a]	5	0	5	Gravel
94	95[a,b,c]	0	0	5	Gravel
95	0	100[f]	0	0	Gravel and Sand
96	75[a]	20	0	5	Gravel
97	80[a,b]	10	0	10	Gravel

[a] - Ephemerellidae, [b] - Heptageniidae, [c] - Baetidae
[d] - Glossosomatidae, [e] - Brachycentridae, [f] - Lepidostomatidae

included feathers, plant material, woody particles, conifer needles, and insect cases. In general, although there were far fewer taxa in the fecal samples than in the stream samples, the relative abundance of taxonomic groups in the fecal samples reflected the abundance of those taxa in the streams. However, some taxa, e.g. Lepidostomatidae and Glossosomatidae, were common in the fecal samples, but poorly represented or absent in the stream samples. This might be due to differential digestibility, to differences in the timing of collection of the fecal and benthic samples, and/or to patchy distribution of some taxa which contributed to sampling error in collection of the benthic samples.

POPULATION DYNAMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

Previous studies in harlequin duck breeding areas have demonstrated correlations between harlequin duck productivity and invertebrate biomass (Bengtson and Ulfstrand 1971) or harlequin duck productivity and stream runoff (Kuchel 1977). We examined these factors by comparing stream flows and invertebrate biomass with harlequin duck productivity over 2 years.

Methods

Stream flows were measured at U.S. Forest Service gaging stations on Upper Priest River and Granite Creek at Lake Pend Oreille. Productivity was compared to monthly stream flows April - August with linear correlation analysis. Benthic

macroinvertebrate samples were collected on Granite Creek at Lake Pend Oreille and Gold Creek at Priest Lake in 1991 and 1992. Samples were collected and analyzed as described in the previous section. Samples were collected from the same areas both years.

Results and Discussion

Average productivity was negatively correlated to May, June, and July streamflows. The closest relationship was apparent between June streamflows and productivity (r = -0.93, P = 0.006). Benthic macroinvertebrate biomass on Gold Creek at Priest Lake and Granite Creek at Lake Pend Oreille did not differ significantly between years (Fig. 1), and harlequin duck productivity was independent of macroinvertebrate biomass (P = 0.41).

The data collected in this study support the conclusion of Kuchel (1977) and others (Diamond and Finnegan 1992) that productivity of harlequin ducks in the Rocky Mountains is inversely related to spring runoff. This might be due to destruction of nests along the streambank and/or the inability of newly hatched ducklings to negotiate high water. Although Bengtson and Ulfstrand (1971) and Gardarsson and Einarsson (1991) documented a relationship between invertebrate biomass and harlequin duck productivity in Iceland, this may be only a secondary consideration, if a factor at all, in the Rocky Mountains. Longer term data would help assess the importance of both factors.



Fig. 1. Benthic macroinvertebrate biomass on 2 harlequin duck breeding streams in northern Idaho, 1991-1992.

NORTHERN IDAHO HARLEQUIN DUCK INVENTORY AND MONITORING PROTOCOL

Research has documented low numbers of harlequin ducks in northern Idaho, but insufficient data are currently available to adequately determine population trend, or effects of management actions. Annual harlequin duck monitoring conducted for at least 10 years is necessary to establish baseline data and to examine relationships of population size and productivity with

environmental factors including stream flows, weather, local management activities, and conditions in coastal areas.

Additionally, although extensive stream surveys have established the overall harlequin duck breeding distribution in northern Idaho (Cassirer et al. 1991), inventory of breeding areas is still incomplete. Inventory should be ongoing to determine the extent of harlequin duck use of streams with unknown status.

These inventory and monitoring guidelines are based on data collected in northern Idaho breeding areas, from the Lochsa River to the Canadian border between 1987 and 1992. Breeding chronology of harlequin ducks varies by area, for instance harlequin duck arrival and breeding activities in Grand Teton National Park, Wyoming occur 2 - 4 weeks later than in northern Idaho (Wallen 1987). Therefore, this protocol is only specifically applicable to the area it was developed, and other areas where similar breeding chronology has been documented.

Monitoring

Northern Idaho streams with documented use by harlequin ducks (Table 12) should be monitored regularly. Streams currently of unknown status should be added to this list in the future if inventory efforts reveal they are harlequin duck breeding streams. Monitoring should be conducted whether or not any management activites are scheduled in the area. Monitoring also can and should be incorporated in the biological evaluation

Table 12. Documented northern Idaho harlequin duck breeding streams.

Stream	Reach
KOOTENAI RIVER DRAINAGE	
Moyie River	Canadian boundary to Moyie Falls
PRIEST AND UPPER PRIEST LAKE DRAINAGE	
Gold Creek	Hemlock Creek to Hughes Fork
Granite Creek	Willow Creek to Blacktail Creek
Hughes Fork	Hughes Meadows to Upper Priest River
Upper Priest River	Upper Priest Falls to 1013 Bridge
Middle Fork East River	Devil's Creek to Priest River(?)
COEUR D'ALENE RIVER DRAINAGE	
N. Fork Coeur d'Alene River	Marten Creek to Teepee Creek
LAKE PEND OREILLE DRAINAGE	
East Fork Lightning Creek	Thunder Creek to Lightning Creek
S. Gold Creek	Road 278 culvert to Lake Pend Oreille
N. Gold Creek	Branch North Gold to Lake Pend Oreille
Granite Creek	Road 278 crossing to Lake Pend Oreille
ST. JOE RIVER DRAINAGE	
St. Joe River	Heller Creek to Marble Creek
Marble Creek	Cornwall Creek to St. Joe River
Simmons Creek	Road 1278 crossing to St. Joe River

Table 12, cont'd. Documented northern Idaho harlequin duck breeding streams.

Stream	Reach
CLEARWATER RIVER DRAINAGE	
Crooked Fork	Shotgun Creek to Lochsa River
White Sands Creek	Colt Creek to Lochsa River
Lochsa River	White Sands Creek to Boulder Creek
N. Fork Clearwater	Niagara Creek to Kelly Creek
Kelly Creek	N. Fork Kelly Creek to Kelly Forks
Little N. Fork Clearwater	Canyon Creek to Foehl Creek
Selway River	MacGruder to Moose Creek

of any activity conducted on harlequin duck streams during the breeding season (April - September) or any activity conducted outside the breeding season that could alter habitat conditions on the stream during the harlequin duck breeding season.

Inventory

Inventory should be conducted on streams with unconfirmed reports of harlequin ducks; on streams adjacent to or tributaries to streams known to be used by harlequin ducks; and on streams which are potentially suitable harlequin duck habitat as described in Cassirer and Groves (1991). Some streams in northern Idaho that remain to be adequately inventoried are

Table 13. Some streams to inventory for harlequin ducks in northern Idaho[a].

Area	Stream	Previous Idaho Conservation Data Center survey dates
KOOTENAI RIVER DRAINAGE	Boundary Creek	August 1989, May and July 1993
	Boulder Creek	July 1990, 1993
	Long Canyon Creek	May and August 1993
	Smith Creek	May and July 1990, July 1993
PRIEST LAKE DRAINAGE	Boulder Creek	May 1992
	Caribou Creek	August 1989, May 1991
	Lion Creek	August 1989, May 1991
	Soldier Creek	June 1987, May 1992
	Trapper Creek	June 1989
	Uleda Creek	
	Two Mouth Creek	May 1991
PACK RIVER DRAINAGE	Grouse Creek	July 1990
COEUR D'ALENE RIVER DRAINAGE	Teepee Creek	May and July 1988
	Independence Creek	May 1987, August 1987
	Pine Creek	
LAKE PEND OREILLE DRAINAGE	Lightning Creek	June and August 1987, May and July 1988
	Trestle Creek	
ST JOE RIVER DRAINAGE	Slate Creek	June 1987, July 1990
	Bussel Creek	
	Mica Creek	July 1988
	Fly Creek	
CLEARWATER DRAINAGE	Bear Creek (Selway)	August 1989, May 1990
	Meadow Creek (Selway)	May 1989
	Whitecap Creek (Selway)	July 1989, May 1990
	S. Fork Clearwater River	May and July 1989
	Crooked River	May 1989

[a] A partial list of inventory needs

Table 13 cont'd. Some streams to inventory for harlequin ducks in northern Idaho[a].

Area	Stream	Previous Idaho Conservation Data Center Surveys
CLEARWATER DRAINAGE cont'd.	Red River	May and July 1989
	Orogrande Creek	July 1988
	Vanderbilt Creek	July 1990
	Weitas Creek	May 1987
	Fish Creek (Lochsa)	May 1987
	Squaw Creek (Lochsa)	May 1993
SALMON RIVER DRAINAGE	Bargamin Creek	
	Ebenezer Creek	

[a] A partial list of inventory needs.

listed in Table 13. This list is by no means complete.

Survey Methodology

Timing is critical for both inventory and monitoring surveys. Timing is probably the most important factor in survey success. For this reason, most surveys must be conducted specifically for harlequin ducks, rather than in combination with fish or other wildlife surveys. In northern Idaho, spring pair surveys should be conducted between April 25 and May 25 (Fig. 2). Although this is the period when pairs are most likely to be observed, even when conducted during this period, surveys underestimate the actual number of pairs present by an average of 25 to 35 percent (Fig. 3). Therefore, 2 surveys should be conducted during this period for monitoring purposes. The survey



Fig. 2. Timing of harlequin duck observations during surveys on 7 streams in northern Idaho, 1991-1992.

with the highest number of ducks should be used for monitoring estimates.

Although the highest numbers of ducklings are observed in early July (Fig. 2), brood surveys conducted for monitoring purposes should occur between July 15 and August 5. Because of mortality rates typically occurring in young ducklings, this later period gives a more accurate estimate of ducklings fledged (Fig. 3). Ducklings should be aged by plumage development (Fig. 4) during brood surveys.



Fig. 3. Estimated accuracy of harlequin duck surveys conducted on 7 streams in northern Idaho, 1991 - 1992.

Inventory surveys should cover the entire stream from 2nd- or 3rd-order headwaters to the mouth. Inventory of this area should be conducted during the spring, and again during the summer, (or until ducks are observed, whichever is first) for at least 2 years before determining stream status. Therefore, inventory should be an ongoing program, not simply associated with proposed management activities.

Little specialized equipment is required for harlequin duck

Fig. 4. Guide to aging harlequin ducklings in the field (from diagram in Dimmick and Pelton 1994:173, after Gollop and Marshall 1954).

surveys. Some necessary equipment is:

8 to 10 power waterproof binoculars

Felt-soled wading boots

Neoprene stocking foot chest waders

Surveys can be conducted during any weather and at any time of day. Surveyors should use binoculars as much as practical, particularly in long, straight stream reaches. Harlequin ducks are commonly observed sitting on instream rocks or on the streambank, swimming or feeding in the middle of the stream, or paddling along the bank eddy. In the spring, the male is usually spotted first. Look carefully for the female nearby, the white spot on the side of her head is usually her most conspicuous feature. Both males and females appear dark in flight, with no white markings on the underside of the wings. The only other duck in Idaho that may be confused with the harlequin is a female bufflehead. However, the white spot on the side of the head of the bufflehead is not as distinct, the white on the wings is visible during flight, and the bufflehead has light colored legs and feet, while the harlequin duck's are dark. Buffleheads are also uncommon streams used by harlequin ducks in northern Idaho.

Surveys can be conducted on foot, by boat, or by driving next to the stream. Walking is the best way to survey most streams. Walking surveys can be conducted in an up- or downstream direction. It is easier to survey downstream, however the ducks will not swim as quickly upstream as they float

downstream, so for an inexperienced observer they may be more observable when surveys are conducted upstream. If a road is available, use a crew of at least 2 people. Drop 1 person off at the beginning of the survey reach, a second person drives to a midpoint, preferably where the truck is visible from the stream or at a bridge or trail crossing, and walks to the end of the survey reach. After ducks are observed move off the stream to walk around them. When surveys are conducted in a downstream direction, you can often get closer to the ducks by making a wide circle around to get below them and approach from downstream. Count on covering about 1 mile per hour in spring surveys and 1.5 miles per hour in summer surveys. Because the ducks are mobile, enough people should survey to cover an entire stream in a day.

Boating is a very good way to survey, especially in the spring. Rafts or drift boats are best, because 1 person can row while 1 or 2 passengers look for ducks. Fifteen to 20 miles of stream is a reasonable distance to cover by boat in a day, but distance covered will vary with water conditions and access. Kayaking is also a good survey method and may be the only way to cover some streams at certain times of year. Depending on the stream and season, kayakers should be comfortable running class IV or V water and should also be familiar with harlequin ducks. Inner tubes may be used in summer surveys when the water is too low for boating but too deep or swift for walking. A wet suit or neoprene chest waders are usually necessary when inner tubing, even in warm weather.

Driving surveys can be conducted by 2 people along roads that closely follow the stream. Drive slowly with the observer in the passenger side of the vehicle next to the stream or in the back of a pickup. Check areas where the stream is not in full view of the road on foot.

The spring pair survey period coincides with peak spring runoff in northern Idaho. Therefore walking surveys of 4th-order or greater streams will usually be conducted by hiking along the streambank. Surveyors should be prepared for inclement weather and snow. If roads are not plowed, snowmachines may be necessary to get to survey areas. Camping out may be required to cover the upper reaches of some streams.

Streams will be relatively low during brood surveys and walking surveys can be conducted by a combination of wading in the stream and walking along the bank. Felt-soled boots with neoprene socks and wool socks are recommended for walking in the stream. Stocking foot chest waders with felt-soled boots may be useful in cooler weather or higher water.

Data Collection

Record data on a standardized form (such as Table 14), and enter the information into a computer data base. Please send copies of all inventory and monitoring data, even when no ducks are observed, as well as reports on streams not previously known to have harlequins to the Idaho Fish and Game Conservation Data Center.

Table 14. Data form for harlequin duck surveys.

HARLEQUIN DUCK SURVEY FORM

Surveyors' names:_____

Address:_____

Date:_____ Time start:_____ Time end:_____

Stream name:_____

Start location:_____

End location:_____

Distance (km):_____

Type of survey (walk, boat, drive):_____

Observations/comments:_____

Harlequin duck observations

Note: Idaho, Montana, Wyoming and several coastal states and provinces have marked harlequin ducks. Colored nasal markers on the bill, and colored, numbered, and metal legbands on both legs are being used. Please check for marks on all harlequins and include a detailed description of any observed.

Time:_____ Number:_____ Sex:_____ Age class:_____

Location: UTMN_____ UTME_____

T_____ R_____ S_____ 1/4_____

Activity/comments:_____

_____

Time:_____ Number:_____ Sex:_____ Age class:_____

Location: UTMN_____ UTME_____

T_____ R_____ S_____ 1/4_____

Activity/comments:_____

_____

Time:_____ Number:_____ Sex:_____ Age class:_____

Location: UTMN_____ UTME_____

T_____ R_____ S_____ 1/4_____

Activity/comments:_____

Send copy to:Idaho Fish & Game,Conservation Data Center,Box 25,Boise,ID 83707.

LITERATURE CITED

Bengtson, S. 1972. Breeding ecology of the harlequin duck, Histrionicus histrionicus, in Iceland. Ornis. Scand. 3:1-19.

_____ and, S. Ulfstrand. 1971. Food resources and breeding frequency of the harlequin duck Histrionicus histrionicus (L.) in Iceland. Ornis Scand. 3:1-19.

Cassirer, E. F., and C. R. Groves. 1990. Distribution, habitat use, and status of harlequin ducks (Histrionicus histrionicus) in northern Idaho, 1990. Idaho Dep. of Fish and Game, Nongame and endangered wildl. prog. 54pp.

_____, and _____. 1991. Harlequin duck ecology in Idaho: 1987-1990. Idaho Dep. of Fish and Game, Nongame and endangered wildl. prog. 93pp.

_____, _____, and R. L. Wallen. 1991. Distribution and population status of harlequin ducks in Idaho. Wilson Bull. 103:723-725.

_____, A. Breault, P. Clarkson, D.L. Genter, R.I. Goudie, B. Hunt, S.C. Latta, G.H. Mittelhauser, M. McCollough, G. Schirato, and R.L. Wallen. 1993a. Status of harlequin ducks (Histrionicus histrionicus) in North America. Report of the Harlequin Duck Working Group, March 1993.

_____, G. Schirato, F. Sharpe, C.R. Groves, and R.N. Anderson. 1993b. Cavity nesting by harlequin ducks in the Pacific Northwest. Wilson Bull. 105:691-694.

Collier, K. J. 1991. Food supplies and diet of blue ducks on rivers in two regions of North Island, New Zealand. New Zealand Journal of Ecology. 15:131-138.

Diamond, S., and P. Finnegan. 1992. Harlequin duck ecology on Montana's Rocky Mountain Front. USDA For. Serv., Rocky Mt. Ranger Dist., Choteau, MT. 61pp.

Dimmick, R. W., and M. R. Pelton. 1994. Criteria of sex and age. Pages 169 - 214 in T. A. Bookhout, ed. Research and management techniques for wildlife and habitats. Fifth ed., The Wildlife Society, Bethesda, MD.

Dzinbal, K. A. 1982. Ecology of harlequin ducks in Prince William Sound, Alaska during summer. M.S. Thesis, Oregon State Univ., Corvallis. 89pp.

Gardarsson, A., and A. Einarsson. 1991. Responses of breeding duck populations to changes in food supply. Paper presented at Aquatic Birds in the Trophic Web of Lakes Symp., Sackville, New Brunswick, April 19-22. 37pp.

Gollop, J. B., and W. H. Marshall. 1954. A guide for aging duck broods in the field. Miss. Flyway Counc. Tech. Sect. Rep. 14pp.

Gustin, J. A. 1993. Summary report of 78 benthic samples collected from selected watersheds within the range of harlequin ducks in northern Idaho. Unpubl. rep. 22pp.

Kuchel, C.R. 1977. Some aspects of the behavior and ecology of harlequin ducks breeding in Glacier National Park, Montana. M.S. Thesis, Univ. of Montana, Missoula. 163pp.

Neu, C.W., C.R. Byers, and J.M. Peek. 1974. A technique for analysis of utilization-availability data. J. Wildl. Manage. 38:541-545.

Wallen, R. L. 1987. Habitat utilization by harlequin ducks in Grand Teton National Park. M.S. Thesis, Montana State Univ., Bozeman. 67pp.

Appendix A. Returns of marked harlequin ducks to northern Idaho streams, 1989 - 1992.

Band no.	Age[a]	Sex	Date marked	1988[b]	1989	1990	1991	1992
90201	AHY	M	05/02	M				
90202	AHY	F	05/02	M	R	R	R	R
90203	AHY	M	05/03	M	R	R	R	R
90204	AHY	F	05/03	M	R	R	R	R
90205	AHY	F	07/15	M				
90206	AHY	F	07/15	M				
90207	AHY	F	07/19	M				
90208	YOY	-	07/19	M				
90209	YOY	-	07/19	M				
90210	YOY	-	07/19	M				
90211	AHY	M	05/25		M			
90212	AHY	M	05/25		M			R
90213	AHY	M	05/26		M	R	R	R
90214	AHY	F	05/26		M			
90215	AHY	M	05/28		M			
90216	AHY	F	05/28		M		R?	
90217	AHY	F	06/26		M	R	R	R
90218	AHY	F	07/03		M	R	R	R
90219	AHY	F	07/04		M			
90220	YOY	-	07/31		M			
90221	YOY	-	07/31		M			
90222	YOY	-	07/31		M			
90223	YOY	-	07/31		M			
90224	YOY	-	07/31		M			
90225	AHY	F	07/31		M			

[a] AHY = after hatch year, YOY - young of the year.
[b] M = marked, R = returned.

Appendix A cont'd. Returns of marked harlequin ducks to northern Idaho streams, 1989 - 1992.

Band no.	Age[a]	Sex	Date marked	1988[b]	1989	1990	1991	1992
90226	YOY	-	08/28		M			
90227	YOY	-	08/28		M			
90228	YOY	-	08/28		M			
90229	YOY	-	08/28		M			
90230	AHY	F	08/28		M	R		
90231	YOY	-	08/29		M			
90232	YOY	-	08/29		M			
90233	YOY	-	08/29		M			
90234	YOY	-	08/29		M			
90235	AHY	M	05/06			M	R	R
90236	AHY	F	05/09				M	R
90237	AHY	M	05/09				M	R
90238	AHY	F	05/16				M	R
90239	AHY	M	05/16				M	R
90240	AHY	M	05/27				M	R
90241	AHY	M	05/21				M	
90242	AHY	F	05/31				M	R
90243	AHY	F	06/10				M	R
90244	AHY	F	07/03				M	R
90245	AHY	F	07/08				M	R
90246	AHY	F	07/17				M	
90247	YOY	-	08/12				M	
90248	YOY	-	08/07				M	
90249	YOY	-	08/07				M	
90250	YOY	-	08/12				M	

[a] AHY = after hatch year, YOY - young of the year.
[b] M = marked, R = returned.

Appendix A cont'd. Returns of marked harlequin ducks to northern Idaho streams, 1989 - 1992.

Band no.	Age[a]	Sex	Date marked	1988[b]	1989	1990	1991	1992
90251	YOY	-	08/12				M	
90252	YOY	-	08/12				M	
90253	AHY	F	08/12				M	R
90254	AHY	F	05/26					M
90255	AHY	F	05/26					M
90256	AHY	M	05/26					M
90257	AHY	M	05/27					M
90258	AHY	M	05/27					M
90259	AHY	F	07/06					M
90260	AHY	F	07/08					M
90261	YOY	M	08/10					M
90262	YOY	F	08/10					M
90263	YOY	F	08/10					M
90264	YOY	M	08/10					M
90265	YOY	M	08/10					M
90266	YOY	F	08/11					M
90267	AHY	F	08/20					M
90268	YOY	M	08/21					M
90269	YOY	M	08/21					M
90270	AHY	F	08/25					M
90271	YOY	F	08/25					M

[a] AHY = after hatch year, YOY - young of the year.
[b] M = marked, R = returned.

Appendix B

Harlequin duck habitat use data sheet

DATE_____ TIME_____ STREAM_____ OBSERVER_____

OBSERVATION TYPE- NO._____SEX_____AGE CLASS_____

ACTIVITY LO LOAFING SW SWIMMING SF SWIMMING/FEEDING FL FLYING

OT OTHER Explain_____

CIRCLE ONE	CIRCLE ONE PER DUCK	CIRCLE ONE	CIRCLE UP TO TWO
HABITAT	**LOCATION**	**SUBSTRATE**	**BANK COMPOSITION**
PO POOL	BA BANK	CL CLAY	TR TREES
BA BACKWATER	LO LOAF	SA SAND	SH SHRUB
RI RIFFLE	EY EDDY	GR GRAVEL	GF GRASS/FORB
RU RUN	ED EDGE	CO COBBLE	MO TREE/SHRUB MOSAIC
GL GLIDE	BT BANK 1/3	BO BOULDER	SA SAND
PW POCKETWATER	CE CENTER	BE BEDROCK	SI SILT
RA RAPID			GR GRAVEL
			DE DEBRIS
			BE BEDROCK

CIRCLE AS APPROPRIATE

OVERSTORY AGE	TIMBER MGMT	CHANNEL TYPE	HUMAN ACCESS
SE SEEDLING	NO NONE	ME MEANDER	AD ADJACENT
SA SAPLING	CL CLEARCUT	BR BRAIDED	NE NEAR
PO POLE	ST SEED TREE	ST STRAIGHT	AC ACCESSIBLE
IM IMMATURE	SW SHELTERWOOD	CU CURVED	IN INACCESSIBLE
MA MATURE	CT COMM. THIN		
OG OLD-GROWTH	SH SELECTION HARVEST		

DEBRIS / 10 M
ENTER # OF EACH TYPE

BR BRIDGE_____
CB COLLAPSED BRIDGE_____
RA RAMP_____
DR DRIFT_____

LOAFING SITES / 10M_____

STREAM WIDTH (M)_____

OVERSTORY SPP._____

DENSIOMETER READING_____ _____ _____ _____

BANK UNDERCUT Y N

VEG. OVERHANG Y N

WATER VELOCITY _____ _____ _____

UTMN_____ UTME_____

T_____ R_____ S_____ 1/4_____

COMMENTS_____

STREAM HABITAT
POOL- deep slow water areas in the stream.
BACKWATER- slow water area out of the main stream channel.
RIFFLE- shallow water areas where the water surface is influenced by the stream bottom.
RUN- deeper than a riffle, no whitewater but velocity greater than 0.3 m/sec, too fast to be a glide or pool.
GLIDE- run areas with velocities < 0.3 m/sec.
POCKETWATER- a run or riffle with boulders (> 30 cm in diameter) which create numerous small pools.
RAPID- deep fast water, water influenced by stream bottom and/or streambank (whitewater).

LOCATION
BANK- on streambank.
LOAF- loafing on rock or log.
EDDY- in an eddy created by a rock or log.
EDGE- at the very edge of the stream next to the bank-in the bank eddy.
BANK 1/3- not directly adjacent to the bank but in the third of the stream closest to the bank, not in an eddy.
CENTER- in the water in the center third of the stream, not in an eddy.

SUBSTRATE
GRAVEL- 0.2-7 cm (0.1"-3") diameter
COBBLE- 8-30 cm (3"-12")
BOULDER- >30 cm

OVERSTORY AGE
SEEDLING- 1-10 years old, < 4.5' tall.
SAPLING- 10-40 years old, > 4.5'tall, DBH <5"
POLE- 40-70 years old, DBH 5"-9".
IMMATURE- 70-100 years old, DBH 9"-14".
MATURE- 100-160 years old, DBH 14"-20".
OLD GROWTH- over 160 years old or DBH > 20".

CHANNEL TYPE
MEANDER- channel follows sinuous curves, deep pools separated by shallow riffles, appears to shift slightly during peak flows.
BRAIDED- channel located in flat bottomed valley, midstream bars occur and divide the stream into several intersecting and shifting channels.
STRAIGHT- stream channel linear, structurally controlled by a "V" shaped valley. No movement of channel during peak flows.
CURVED- stream channel curves or zig-zags more abruptly than a meander. Channel structurally controlled by a "V" shaped valley, no movement during peak flows.

HUMAN ACCESS
ADJACENT-established area of human activity maintained within 10 m.
NEAR- established area of human activity maintained within 10-50 m.
ACCESSIBLE- >50 m from human activity, accessible by boat or trail.
INACCESSIBLE- >50 m from human activity, not accessible by boat or trail.

WOODY DEBRIS
BRIDGE- log across stream.
COLLAPSED BRIDGE- log across stream, submerged in the middle of the stream.
RAMP- one end of log in the stream, the other on the bank.
DRIFT- log floating in stream.

LOAFING SITE- rocks or log in the stream completely surrounded by water, suitable for resting site.

VEGETATIVE OVERHANG-vegetation extending over the stream within 12" of the water surface.

Appendix C

Summary of organisms encountered in 78 benthic samples collected in northern Idaho

Appendix C. Summary of organisms encountered in 78 benthic samples collected in northern Idaho, 1991 - 1992.

Class	Order	Family	Genus	Species	Tolerance Value *
Insecta					
	Ephemeroptera				
		Baetidae			
			Baetis	sp.	4
		Ephemerellidae			
			Drunella	*doddsi*	1
			Drunella	*grandis*	
			Ephemerella	*aurivilli*	
		Heptageniidae			
			Cinygmula	sp.	4
			Epeorus	*longimanus*	
			Rhithrogena	robusta	
		Leptophlebidae			
			Paraleptophlebia	*debilis*	2
		Siphlonuridae			
			Ameletus	sp.	7
	Plecoptera				
		Chloroperlidae			
			Alloperla	*forcipata*	1
			Kathroperla	*perdita*	
			Sweltsa	sp.	
		Perlidae			
			Hesperoperla	*pacifica*	1
		Perlodidae			
			Isoperla	sp.	2

Appendix C, cont'd. Summary of organisms encountered in 78 benthic samples collected in northern Idaho, 1991 - 1992.

Class	Order	Family	Genus	Species	Tolerance Value
Insecta					
	Trichoptera				
		Brachycentridae	*Brachycentrus*	*americanus*	1
		Glossosomatidae	*Glossosoma*	sp.	0
		Hydropsychidae	*Parapsyche*	*elsis*	4
		Limnephilidae	*Neophylax*	sp.	4
			Psychoglypha	*suborealis*	
		Rhyacophilidae	*Rhyacophila*	*neograndis*	0
			Rhyacophila	*verrula*	
	Diptera				
		Athericidae	*Atherix*	sp.	2
		Blephariceridae			0
		Chironomidae			6
		Pelecorhynchidae	*Glutops*	sp.	N.A.
		Simuliidae	*Twinna*	*tibblesi*	6
		Tipulidae	*Hexatoma*	sp.	3

Appendix C, cont'd. Summary of organisms encountered in 78 benthic samples collected in northern Idaho, 1991 - 1992.

Class	Order	Family	Genus	Species	Tolerance Value
Insecta					
	Coleoptera				
		Elmidae			4
			Dubiraphia	*giullianii*	
Gastropoda					
	Limnophila				
		Physidae			8 **
Pelecypoda (= Bivalvia)					
		Sphaeridae			8 **
			Pisidium	sp.	
Acarina					
		Hydracarina			4 **
Oligochaeta					
	Limicolae				10 **
Turbellaria					
	Tricladida				
		Planariidae			4 **
			Planaria	sp.	

These values are for use with the biotic index scale of 0-10 with 0 being the least tolerant.

* Hilsenhoff's Family Level Pollution Tolerance Values. Hilsenhoff (1988).

** Tolerance Values for some macrioinvertebrates not included in Hilsenhoff (1988) (EPA/440/4-89/001, 1989).

Submitted by: E. Frances Cassirer

E. Frances Cassirer
Sr. Wildlife Research Biologist

Approved by:

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

for Charles E. Harris

Tom Reinecker, Chief
Bureau of Wildlife

Wayne Melquist

Wayne Melquist
State Nongame Wildlife Manager &
Endangered Species Coordinator