ARIZONA BALD EAGLE NESTWATCH PROGRAM: 1998 SUMMARY REPORT

Gregory L. Beatty, Bald Eagle Management Coordinator James T. Driscoll, Bald Eagle Biologist John G. Koloszar, Nongame Bird Biologist Nongame Branch, Wildlife Management Division



Technical Report 139 Nongame and Endangered Wildlife Program Program Chief: Terry B. Johnson Arizona Game and Fish Department 2221 West Greenway Road Phoenix, Arizona 85023-4399

April 1999

The Arizona Game and Fish Commission receives Federal financial assistance in Sport Fish and Wildlife Restoration. Under Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the U.S. Department of the Interior prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, sex, or disability. If you believe you have been discriminated against in any program, activity, or facility as described above, or if you desire further information please write to:

Arizona Game and Fish Department Office of the Deputy Director 2221 West Greenway Road DOHQ Phoenix, Arizona 85023-4399

and

The Office for Diversity and Civil Rights U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 4040 North Fairfax Drive Room 300 Arlington, Virginia 22203

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT COMPLIANCE

The Arizona Game and Fish Department complies with all provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act. This document is available in alternative format by contacting Terry B. Johnson, Nongame Branch, Arizona Game and Fish Department, 2221 West Greenway Road, Phoenix, Arizona 85023-4399 - (602) 789-3501 or TTY 7-800-367-8939.

RECOMMENDED CITATION

Beatty, G.L., J.T. Driscoll, and J.G. Koloszar. 1999. Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1998 summary report. Nongame and Endangered Wildlife Program Technical Report Number 139. Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, Arizona.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We used field reports by the following nestwatchers to generate this report: Sarah Billig and Tom Wolfe, Bartlett Breeding Area; Chris Buelow, Jenna Garvey, Carey Hill, Laurie Houchins, and Michael VanAntwerp, Box Bar Breeding Area; Devin Biggs and Wyatt Nimitz, Fort McDowell Breeding Area; Wendy Peacock and David Tidhar, Horseshoe and Luna Breeding Area; Jennifer Jones and Devlin Madrone, Ladders Breeding Area; Robert Chapman and David Hood, Pleasant Breeding Area; Beth Cable and Troy Rintz, 76 Breeding Area; Scott Brownwood and Gary Cress, Sycamore Creek Breeding Area; Nicole Molitor and Carol Strojny, Tonto Breeding Area; and Jason Beason and Kerry Noonan, Tower Breeding Area.

We acknowledge and appreciate the assistance of the following people: Carvel Bass, Army Corps of Engineers; Amy Heuslein, Bureau of Indian Affairs; Bob Hall, Bureau of Land Management; Henry Messing, Bureau of Reclamation; Marilyn Ethelbah, Clinton Pattea, and Darrel Russell, Fort McDowell Indian Community; Gary Hyduke and Tom Valencia, Maricopa County Parks; Ron Chiago and Ivan Makil, Salt River Pima Indian Community; John Keane, Salt River Project; Amanda Moors and Paul Nosie, Jr., San Carlos Apache Game and Fish Department; Tom Gatz and Mary Richardson, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; Janey Agyagos, Jerry Bradley, Jim Copeland, Patti Fenner, Terry Myers, Mike Ross, Bob Shields, and Albert Sillas, U.S. Forest Service; Joe Jojola and Cynthia Westfall, White Mountain Apache Game and Fish Department; Rich Glinski, Dan Groebner, Mike Ingraldi, Terry Johnson, Susi MacVean, Amy Mazurcyk, and Shelly Shepherd, Arizona Game and Fish Department.

PROJECT FUNDING

Funding for this project was provided by: the Arizona Game and Fish Department's Heritage Fund; Arizona's Nongame Wildlife Checkoff; Army Corps of Engineers, Luke Air Force Base, Salt River Project; U.S. Bureau of Reclamation #7-FC-32-0090; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Project W-95-M (Jobs 1 and 4) under the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (Pittman-Robertson Act), and Project E5 (Job 34) under Title VI of the Endangered Species Act; and U.S. Forest Service, Tonto National Forest #3-92-12-043.

| Introduction1 |
|--|
| Study Area |
| Methods |
| Results and Discussion |
| Program |
| Intervention |
| Box Bar Breeding Area |
| Fort McDowell Breeding Area |
| Ladders Breeding Area |
| San Carlos Breeding Area |
| Breeding Area Summaries |
| Productivity Overview |
| Bartiell Diccullig Area |
| Fort McDowell Breeding Area |
| Horseshoe Breeding Area |
| Ladders Breeding Area |
| Luna Breeding Area |
| Pleasant Breeding Area14 |
| 76 Breeding Area15 |
| Sycamore Breeding Area15 |
| Tonto Breeding Area |
| Tower Breeding Area |
| Literature Cited |
| Appendix A: 1998 Bald Eagle Reproduction Summaries |
| Appendix B: Bartlett Breeding Area Summaries |
| Appendix C: Box Bar Breeding Area Summaries |
| Appendix D: Ft. McDowell Breeding Area Summaries25 |
| Appendix E: Horseshoe Breeding Area Summaries |
| Appendix F: Ladders Breeding Area Summaries |
| Appendix G: Luna Breeding Area Summaries |
| Appendix H: Pleasant Breeding Area Summaries |
| Appendix I: 76 Breeding Area Summaries |
| Appendix J: Sycamore Breeding Area Summaries |
| Appendix K: Tonto Breeding Area Summaries |
| Appendix L: Tower Breeding Area Summaries |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure 1. | Location | of known | Arizona | bald eagle | breeding | areas, | 1998 | 3 |
|-----------|----------|----------|---------|------------|----------|--------|------|---|
| | | ÷ | | LIST OF | TABLES | | | |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table 1. Arizona bald eagle productivity for 1998 | 19 |
|--|----|
| Table 2. Arizona bald eagle productivity summary for 1998 | 20 |
| Table 3. Observed human activity and bald eagle behavior, Bartlett BA, | 21 |
| Table 4. Observed foraging events and success, Bartlett BA | 21 |
| Table 5. Observed prey types delivered to nest, Bartlett BA | 22 |
| Table 6. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, Bartlett BA | 22 |
| Table 7. Observed human activity and bald eagle behavior, Box Bar BA | 23 |
| Table 8. Vehicles along FS Road 160 entering the Box Bar BA | 23 |
| Table 9. Observed foraging events and success, Box Bar BA | 24 |
| Table 10. Observed prey types delivered to nest, Box Bar BA | 24 |
| Table 11. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, Box Bar BA | 24 |
| Table 12. Observed human activity and bald eagle behavior, Ft. McDowell BA | 25 |
| Table 13. Observed prey types delivered to the nest, Ft. McDowell BA | 25 |
| Table 14. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, Ft. McDowell BA | 26 |
| Table 15. Observed human activity and bald eagle behavior, Horseshoe BA | 27 |
| Table 16. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, Horseshoe BA | 27 |
| Table 17. Observed human activity and bald eagle behavior, Ladders BA | 28 |
| Table 18. Observed foraging events and success, Ladders BA | 28 |
| Table 19. Observed prey types delivered to nest, Ladders BA | 29 |
| Table 20. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, Ladders BA | 29 |
| Table 21. Observed human activity and bald eagle behavior, Luna BA | 30 |
| Table 22. Observed foraging events and success, Luna BA | 30 |
| Table 23. Observed prey types delivered to the nest, Luna BA | 31 |
| Table 24. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, Luna BA | 31 |
| Table 25. Observed human activity and bald eagle behavior, Pleasant BA | 32 |
| Table 26. Watercraft compliance at southern buoy closure boundary, Pleasant BA | 32 |
| Table 27. Observed foraging events and success, Pleasant BA | 33 |
| Table 28. Observed prey types delivered to the nest, Pleasant BA | 33 |
| Table 29. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, Pleasant BA | 33 |
| Table 30. Observed human activity and bald eagle behavior, 76 BA | 34 |
| Table 31. Observed prey types delivered to the nest, 76 BA | 34 |
| Table 32. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, 76 BA | 34 |
| Table 33. Observed human activity and bald eagle behavior, Sycamore BA | 35 |
| Table 34. Observed foraging events and success, Sycamore BA | 36 |
| Table 35. Observed prey types delivered to the nest, Sycamore BA | 36 |
| Table 36. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, Sycamore BA | 36 |
| Table 37. Observed human activity and bald eagle behavior, Tonto BA | 37 |
| Table 38. Observed prey types delivered to the nest, Tonto BA | 37 |

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

| Table 39. Observed human activity and bald eagle behavior, Tower BA | 38 |
|---|----|
| Table 40. Observed foraging events and success, Tower BA | 39 |
| Table 41. Observed prey types delivered to the nest, Tower BA | 39 |
| Table 42. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, Tower BA | 39 |

ARIZONA BALD EAGLE NESTWATCH PROGRAM: 1998 SUMMARY REPORT

Gregory L. Beatty, James T. Driscoll, and John G. Koloszar

INTRODUCTION

In 1978, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) classified the bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) as endangered in 43 states (including Arizona) and threatened in five others. In 1995, the USFWS (1995) downlisted the bird to threatened in all recovery regions of the lower 48 states. It is not endangered or threatened in Alaska and does not occur in Hawaii. Yet, the bald eagle retains protection under the Endangered Species Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. A recovery plan (USFWS 1982) guides management of the southwestern population, which includes Arizona's breeding bald eagles.

Many Arizona bald eagle breeding areas (BA) are subjected to human activities that can affect breeding success. Consequently, as information on certain BAs became clearer, the demand for progressive management increased. Protective efforts began in 1978, when the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and two Maricopa Audubon Society volunteers monitored a nest. Soon this monitoring effort expanded into the Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program (ABENWP).

As we discovered more BAs, interagency coordination became more important. To provide oversight, managing agencies formed the Southwestern Bald Eagle Management Committee (SWBEMC) in 1984. The SWBEMC is a cooperative effort among federal, state, and county agencies, private groups, and Native American Tribes committed to bald eagle conservation. In 1986, on behalf of the SWBEMC, the USFWS assumed coordination responsibilities for the ABENWP and expanded its scope. The USFWS passed the lead to the Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD) in 1991.

The ABENWP has three principal goals: conservation, data collection, and education. Because of a high recreation level along central Arizona rivers, seasonal closures surround many nest areas. Nestwatchers interact with people who enter these closures, educate them, distribute pamphlets, and direct them out of the area. To help agencies make better decisions, nestwatchers also collect information on eagle ecology, productivity, and behavior in response to human activities. Possibly, the most tangible benefit of the ABENWP is determining when eagles are in life threatening situations. Constant monitoring makes it possible to intervene and rescue birds in those situations.

This report summarizes the most significant discoveries at each BA monitored in 1998. Among the topics discussed are length of observation, timing of breeding events, human activity, food habits, and management activities.

STUDY AREA

ABENWP personnel monitored bald eagle breeding areas along creeks, reservoirs, and rivers throughout Arizona (Fig. 1). All monitored BAs (except the Luna BA) were in the central part of the state. The most northerly BA was Tower, near Clarkdale, and the most southerly was Winkelman, along the Gila River. The most westerly BA was Lake Pleasant, along the Agua Fria River, and the most easterly BA was Luna, near the town of Alpine. Elevations of the monitored areas ranged from 439 m (1440 ft) at the Sycamore BA to 2409 m (7900 ft) at the Luna BA.

Most Arizona bald eagles breed in the central part of the state at elevations of 329 m (1080 ft) to 1719 m (5640 ft). This portion of the state is within the Upper and Lower Sonoran Life Zones (Merriam 1898), which include riparian habitats and transition areas of both zones. The representative vegetation includes Arizona sycamore (Platanus wrightii), blue palo verde (Cercidium floridum), cholla (Opuntia spp.), Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii), Goodding willow (Salix gooddingii), mesquite (Prosopis spp.), saguaro (Carnegiea gigantea), and tamarisk (Tamarix pentandra) (Brown 1982). Pinyon pine(Pinus spp.) and juniper (Juniperus spp.) are found in the transition areas.

The Luna BA is one of two known Arizona BAs found at high elevation. This BA is within the Montane-Conifer Forest zone characterized as having ponderosa pine (Pinus ponderosa), white fir (Abies concolor), Douglas fir (Pseudotsuga menziesii), and quaking aspen (Populus tremuloides) (Brown 1982).

METHODS

In late summer and early fall 1997, AGFD advertised for nestwatchers through the American Ornithologists Union's Newsletter, and job placement services at colleges and universities nationwide. Public discussions, the Internet, word-of-mouth, and brochures also contributed to the pool of applicants. AGFD hired nestwatchers as private consultants.

After selection of personnel, three meetings were held to orient nestwatchers. The first meeting prepared nestwatchers for the field, explained data forms and bald eagle emergency protocol (eaglets falling out of the nest, entanglement in fishing line, and so on). The following day we discussed Arizona's bald eagle history, ecology, and the role nestwatchers play in management. At the end of the meeting, nestwatch partners were selected. The last meeting took place after the first week in the field. We reconvened and answered questions about data forms and the content of final reports. We discussed any additional problems on an individual basis in the field or at the office.



Figure 1. Location of known Arizona bald eagle breeding areas, 1998.

| Arizona Game and Fish Department | April 1999 |
|---|------------|
| NGTR 139: Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1998 Summary Report | Page 4 |

We selected the BAs to be monitored based upon the level of human activity near the nest area. Monitored BAs included all active BAs with legal closures (Bartlett, Box Bar, Ladders, Lake Pleasant, Luna, 76, and Tower) and a few BAs without closures, but with high levels of human activity (Fort McDowell, Horseshoe, Sycamore, Tonto, and Winkelman).

Field work began the first week of February after orientation, and continued until the eaglets fledged in May and June. Teams of two maintained a ten-day on, four-day off schedule. Each work period included weekends and Fridays to cover heavy recreational days. Nestwatchers devoted half of each ten-day period (weekends and every other Friday) to dawn-to-dusk data collection. The other half was spent collecting supplemental data on eagle behavior. A four-day off period occurred every other Monday through Thursday. Due to constant human activity, nestwatchers monitored the Box Bar BA everyday with a two to five person team.

Nestwatchers recorded all bald eagle data from observation points within the nest area. We selected observation points to provide optimal viewing, while minimizing impact to eagles. Nestwatchers used spotting scopes (15x to 45x) and binoculars to view eagles. They recorded observations of foraging events, human activity, low-flying aircraft, nesting behavior, prey deliveries, wildlife interactions, and wildlife sightings on field forms.

Within an arbitrary 1.0 km (3300 ft) radius of an eagle or nest, nestwatchers recorded all human activities and the associated eagle behavior. We classified bald eagle behavior in response to human activity into seven categories: none, watched, restless, flushed, left area, unknown, and bird not in area. Nestwatchers recorded "no response," if eagles performed their normal activities without acknowledging a human activity. They marked "watched", if an eagle looked at an activity without displaying any other observable reaction. If an eagle vocalized, moved noticeably on its perch, or displayed any overt reaction without leaving its perch, they recorded "restless." If an eagle left its perch quickly in response to the human activity, they recorded a "flush." A "left area" response refers to an eagle that became intolerant and left the area. They recorded "unknown" if an eagle's response could not be seen and marked "bird not in area" if an eagle was not present when an activity occurred.

Nestwatchers documented all aircraft below the 600 m (2000 ft) Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) recommended ceiling within 1.0 km (3300 ft) of an eagle/nest (and the birds associated behavior). They estimate the height of an aircraft using elevations of known landmarks (such as the nest or a nearby cliff) derived from topographic maps. We sent the low-flying aircraft forms (describing identification numbers and flight paths) to USFWS law enforcement if an aircraft was regularly flying through a BA at exceedingly low levels (<175 m or 500 ft), and/or caused an eagle to respond significantly.

At the southern end of the Lake Pleasant closure, nestwatchers documented the amount and type of watercraft activity. They recorded all boats or jet-skis approaching the buoy line and compliance with the closure. If watercraft entered the closure and were able to get past the nestwatchers, they

were considered "inside the closure." Conversely, watercraft which nestwatchers could contact, or approached the buoy line and complied, were "at the closure."

Nestwatchers recorded human activity differently at the Luna Lake and Box Bar BAs. Due to constant activity within 1.0 km (3300 ft) of both nests, they were unable to record all activities and the eagle's subsequent response to each one. Instead, they recorded only activities that occurred within the legal closures (Luna Lake closure was new in 1998) and the bird's associated behavior.

Nestwatchers recorded all aspects of the bald eagle's natural history. They documented interactions with other wildlife; foraging events; frequency, type, and species of prey delivered to the nest; and eagle nesting behavior (time incubating, attending the nest, and feeding the young). In this report, we discuss only the eagle's food habits (foraging events and prey deliveries). To record information accurately, nestwatchers used nest maps with river kilometer designations and a guide to commonly taken fish species (Hunt and others 1992).

Nestwatchers provided their own transportation, gas, supplies, binoculars, and food. They also provided their own housing on days off. A total of 23 nestwatchers participated in the ABENWP in 1998.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

PROGRAM

Since nestwatchers concentrated their efforts within the nest area, this bias must be considered when extrapolating conclusions about foraging locations or habitat utilization. Nevertheless, information gathered by this approach helps inform managing agencies about the breeding pair's habits, potential conflicts, and necessary management activities. Further, since eagles are commonly found in the nest area during the breeding season, it is logical to concentrate management in this area. Certainly, important foraging areas, perches, and roosts away from the nest should not be ignored.

Nestwatchers monitored 13 BAs in 1998: Bartlett, Box Bar, Doka, Fort McDowell, Horseshoe, Ladders, Luna, Pleasant, 76, Sycamore, Tonto, Tower, and Winkelman. We only monitored the Doka and Winkelman BA for a short time, and because of minimal information, their results are not discussed. The final status of the monitored nests was: 1 occupied, 2 failed, and 10 successful (Postupalsky 1974). Sixteen young fledged from 10 successful sites.

INTERVENTION

Box Bar Breeding Area

After falling from the nest on May 11, the Box Bar eaglet was returned on May 13. The nestling fell from the nest at 11 weeks (flying age), but remained on the ground until we picked it up on

| Arizona Game and Fish Department | April 1999 |
|---|------------|
| NGTR 139: Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1998 Summary Report | Page 6 |

May 13. The eaglet was placed in a large snag near the nest to keep it away from ground predators (that is coyotes) and to give it height for flying. Unfortunately, when we returned to the observation point, the snag and eaglet could not be seen. Consequently, we decided to move the young bird to a different location. While trying to recapture the eaglet, it jumped from the snag and landed (very poorly) on the ground. Based upon the apparent lack of flying skills, we returned it to the nest where it fledged on May 18.

Fort McDowell Breeding Area

The Ft. McDowell nestling fell from the nest on three occasions before being diagnosed with cataracts. The 44 day old eaglet first fell on March 28. While on the ground, it did not appear alert. We took the bird to The Phoenix Zoo where Dr. Kathy Orr discovered a cracked coracoid (collarbone). Because of the eagle's young age, we determined it would be best to return it to the nest; the bone would heal before it was ready to fly. We returned the nestling on March 29, however, it fell again on March 30. We took it to Liberty Wildlife Rehabilitation for rehydration and food, and returned it on April 1. Again, the nestling fell on April 5. Following a close inspection, we concluded the nestling was blind. Dr. Orr confirmed our suspicion and diagnosed it as having cataracts. The nestling died in captivity on April 11 of unknown causes, however, we suspect the repeated falls or the source of the cataracts contributed.

The behavior of this eaglet was, upon retrospect, indicative of its blindness. The eaglet was constantly checking its footing in the nest by lifting its feet up and down. Because it regularly sought shade from a branch at the edge of the nest, it repeatedly fell. We observed it on more than one occasion lose its balance after placing its foot over the edge of the nest. It also was not responsive when the adults arrived with food. Typically, eaglets rush to the adult, lower their heads, and beg. However, when the adult would arrive with food, the eaglet did not respond. Therefore, the adult did not try to feed. Yet, throughout the day it was obvious the eaglet was hungry because of its begging.

This is the first recorded instance of cataracts in an Arizona eagle. Based upon nestwatchers observations, the eaglet could see during its first five weeks of life, but lost its sight during its sixth week. Dr. Orr believes cataracts can develop quickly. Following its death, she performed tests for Newcastle disease and encephalitis (a cause of cataracts in nestling flamingos at The Phoenix Zoo). Results were negative. Tissue was sent to the National Wildlife Health Center in Madison, Wisconsin for further analysis.

Ladders Breeding Area

One of the Ladders eaglets fell from the nest on May 2. The bird was found in good health below the nest on May 3 and replaced. It later fledged on either May 17 or 23.

San Carlos Breeding Area

Nest monitors from the San Carlos Apache Tribe thought both San Carlos eaglets had fledged between May 11 and 13. However, they saw only one of the juveniles on May 13. On May 15, we

discovered the second juvenile on the ground below the nest. Due to its lack of flying ability and an unusual protrusion on its keel, we took the juvenile to Dr. Kathy Orr at The Phoenix Zoo. The juvenile was rehabilitated for a broken keel and released back into the breeding area on June 30.

BREEDING AREA SUMMARIES

Productivity Overview

The 1998 Arizona bald eagle breeding season was the fourth consecutive year in which over 20 nestlings fledged (21 fledged). Yet, only 14 of the 36 occupied sites were successful (Appendix A, Tables 1, 2), which resulted in a rather low overall nest success (n=0.39).

The increase in the number of BAs during the 1990s appears to have stabilized the production of annual fledglings. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the number of fledglings fluctuated from 0 (1972) to 24 (1988). However, since 1993, the annual number of fledglings produced has varied between 18 and 25 (mean=22).

Bartlett Breeding Area

| Observation Period Observatio | n dates | February 6 to May 17 |
|-------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|
| Total monit | oring days/hours | |
| Eagle Identification Male | | Unbanded eagle in adult plumage. |
| Female | | Unbanded eagle in adult plumage. |

Nestwatchers observed a fishhook lodged in the beak of one nestling on April 10. The eaglet apparently removed the hook by itself within 30 minutes. Within a day or two after fledging, we could not find the juveniles along the river. Nestwatchers later found them in Indian Springs Wash, a steep-canyoned drainage behind the nest.

Human activity.--Nestwatchers recorded 150 human activities (Appendix B, Table 3). Aircraft (small planes, helicopters, and jets) (n=69) and watercraft (canoes, kayaks and rafters) (n=47) represented 77.3% of all recorded human activity. The remaining 22.7% (n=34) were of seven different terrestrial types.

Two activities elicited a significant response from the bald eagles. A small plane caused the adults to be restless, and the adult male flushed when two men appeared on the cliff above its perch. The men, traveling in their jeep, were reportedly lost and found themselves on the road above the nest.

A noteworthy human activity, which was absent this year, was recreational shooting. Since 1993, nestwatchers have recorded gunshots every year except 1995 (high river flows during the breeding season minimized human activity). In 1997, USFS restricted target shooting along the lower Verde River. This year, it seems the shooting restrictions combined with high river flows (above 1000 cubic feet per second from March through April) eliminated recreational shooting and decreased other terrestrial human activity.

| Arizona Game and Fish Department | April 1999 |
|---|------------|
| NGTR 139: Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1998 Summary Report | Page 8 |

*Food Habits.--*Nestwatchers observed 18 foraging attempts in the nest area (Appendix B, Table 4). The male was successful in 9 of 15 foraging attempts. The female made three successful attempts. However, early in the season, they observed the eagles returning from the Needle Rock area (downstream about 5 km/3 mi from the nest) with food. As the season progressed, more fish were caught in the nest area and from the reservoir (largemouth bass, black crappie, and so forth).

The eagles delivered 123 prey items to the nest (Appendix B, Table 5). The male delivered 75.6% (n=93) and the female delivered 24.4% (n=30). Fish comprised 87.8% (n=108) of the prey. Fish identified in the nest include suckers (n=27), channel catfish (n=19), largemouth bass (n=10), black crappie (n=9), bluegill (n=2), carp (n=1), and sunfish (n=1) (Appendix B, Table 6). Birds and mammals identified were American coot (n=2), grebes (n=1), squirrels (n=2), and western cottontail (n=1).

Management Activities.--1. The Tonto National Forest closed an area surrounding the nest.

| Box Bar Breeding Are | <u>a</u> | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Observation Period | Observation dates | February 6 to May 22 |
| | Dawn-to-dusk hours | |
| | Total monitoring days/hours | |
| Eagle Identification | Male Blue VID band left leg - | - USFWS band right, adult plumage. |
| e e | Female Blue VID band left leg - USI | FWS band right, near-adult plumage. |

One eaglet fell from the nest on May 11 (see Intervention Section). The bird fell from the nest at 11 weeks (flying age), but remained on the ground until we picked it up on May 13. Based upon the apparent lack of flying skills, we returned it to the nest where it fledged on May 18.

Human Activity.--Nestwatchers recorded 241 human activities within the closure (Appendix C, Table 7). Aircraft (small planes and helicopters) represented 58.9% (n=142) of all recorded activities. The remaining 99 activities fell into 11 categories. Due to the proximity of the Rio Verde Riding Club's stable, horseback riding represented the most regular and frequent terrestrial activity inside the closure (n=23).

Twenty-seven activities inside the closure caused the eagles to respond significantly (restless, flush, left area). Out of all the monitored sites, nestwatchers recorded this pair being disturbed the most. Activities causing a significant response were aircraft (n=6), horseback riders (n=4), OHVs (n=5), hikers (n=5), agency workers (n=4), shooters (n=1), and construction (n=2).

Proximity to an activity was not correlated with the level of an eagle's response. Horseback riders 300 m (1000 ft) from an eagle caused the birds to flush. However, on another occasion, horseback riders only caused the eagles to watch after approaching within 25 m (80 ft). Hikers within the closure caused eagles to flush at various distances within 500 m (1600 ft).

The 241 recorded human activities may underestimate the actual amount of activity in the nest area, but does reflect activity within the closure. Due to the large volume of people, it was impossible to track each activity and the bird's associated response. Additionally, nestwatchers could not see the west side of the river, and did not record visitors to the observation point.

To inform recreationists of the eagles, the closure, and to document the level of human activity entering the core nest area, we stationed nestwatchers on FS Road 160 (just west of the parking area). In 27 monitoring days (primarily on weekends and holidays), 1322 vehicles entered the core nest area (Appendix C, Table 8). The most vehicles were recorded in April (n=622).

Management of the Box Bar BA required two teams (five people). All five people were present on weekends. Two people at FS Road 160 recorded vehicles and educated people; the other three collected data and educated people visiting the Rio Verde Ranch observation point.

There was a distinct difference in attitude between the behavior of people at FS Road 160 and at the observation point. Generally, people were indifferent at FS Road 160, wanting to know only where they could or could not go. Some were angry about the USFS day-use fee and believed nestwatchers were there to enforce the mandatory charge. Those who showed interest were invited to the observation point to see the eagles. Nestwatchers estimated that nearly 1000 residents and friends from the nearby community of Rio Verde visited the observation point. It was clear the eagles, the nestwatchers, and the scopes were a fascinating attraction.

This site continues to be the most difficult BA to manage. Where typically two monitors are sufficient, over the last two seasons it is apparent that the four people, daily monitoring, and contacting recreationists along FS Road 160 are required. This effort will become more important as homes are built along Dynamite Road and at Rio Verde Ranch (a 360-unit housing complex and 18-hole golf course are proposed for development across the river from the nest).

*Food Habits.--*Nestwatchers observed 37 foraging attempts in the nest area between river kilometers 24.0 and 24.7 (Appendix C, Table 9). The male foraged 23 times and was successful in 21. The female was successful in all 14 foraging events. Fish were captured 34 times.

Although the river flows fluctuated due to heavy rainfall and water releases from Bartlett Dam, the eagles seemed to adapt. One river braid in the nest area remained slow and shallow during high flows. Nestwatchers observed the eagles foraging there 24 times (successful 23 times). Each attempt originated from the same snag perch and the strike point into the river was 10 meters away.

Nestwatchers observed 106 prey deliveries to the nest (Appendix C, Table 10). The male (n=47) and female (n=58) delivered similar amounts. Fish (n=72) were the most common prey type delivered. Prey items identified in the nest were suckers (n=23), largemouth bass (n=3), carp (n=2), back crappie (n=1), catfish (n=1), rats (n=1), and rabbits (n=1) (Appendix C, Table 11).

| Arizona Game and Fish Department | April 1999 |
|---|------------|
| NGTR 139: Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1998 Summary Report | Page 10 |

Management Activities.--1. The USFS, Cave Creek Ranger District, enlarged the closure to the north. 2. Nestwatchers were active in educating people through contact along FS Road 160, local horseback tours, and from the local Rio Verde community. 3. Due to heavy recreation, we used two nestwatch teams to monitor the site every day. 4. We enlisted the support of the Rio Verde Ranch to allow nestwatchers to camp and monitor from their property. 5. A newspaper article on the ABENWP at Box Bar appeared in The Arizona Republic's "Rep" entertainment guide. 6. AGFD purchased closure and interpretive signs.

Fort McDowell Breeding Area

| Observation Period | Observation dates | February 6 to April 5 |
|----------------------|--|--------------------------|
| | Dawn-to-dusk days/hours | 50 days/245 hours |
| | Total monitoring days/hours | 43 days/405 hours |
| Eagle Identification | Male Blue VID band left leg - USFWS band right | ght, near-adult plumage. |
| 0 0 | Female Unbanded | eagle in adult plumage. |

Both Fort McDowell eaglets died before fledging. One eaglet disappeared at three weeks old. The other eaglet developed cataracts and died in captivity (see Intervention Section).

*Human Activity.--*Nestwatchers recorded 369 human activities (Appendix D, Table 12). The majority (86.2%) of activity was low flying aircraft (small planes, helicopters, and military jets). Fifty-one terrestrial activities represented eight different types (drivers, gunshots, agency workers, woodcutters, OHVs, anglers, picnickers, and boaters).

Thirteen activities caused the eagles to either be restless (n=1) or flush (n=12). Our banding and rescue activities caused the birds to flush on five occasions. Drivers traveling along the river and within 75 m (150 ft) of a bird caused a flushed response. While low-flying aircraft were the most common occurrence, they only elicited a significant response three times.

An increase in Fort McDowell's police force helped maintain a safer place for the eagles to breed. We took the officers to the nest areas, introduced them to the nestwatchers, and made them aware of the program's goals. In addition, Fort McDowell restricted non-tribal recreational use of the river area. The combination of the new restrictions and increased patrol efforts helped eliminate many vagrants and illegal activities.

Nestwatchers contacted 52 groups of people. While they categorized most as being friendly and attentive, some ignored their guidance. These individuals often flushed the eagles.

Food Habits.--Nestwatchers observed 53 prey deliveries to the nest (Appendix D, Table 13). The male (n=29) and female (n=24) delivered similar quantities of prey and nearly all prey types were fish (92.5%). They identified suckers (n=29), carp (n=1), and channel catfish (n=1). The remaining prey items were either unknown fish (n=18), unknown birds (n=2), or unknowns (n=2) (Appendix D, Table 14). Nestwatchers did not see any foraging attempts.

| Arizona Game and Fish Department | April 1999 |
|---|------------|
| NGTR 139: Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1998 Summary Report | Page 11 |

Management Activities.--1. A meeting between AGFD and Fort McDowell before the breeding season helped educate Tribal police about eagles and the nestwatcher's duties. 2. Fort McDowell restricted non-tribal use of the river area.

Horseshoe Breeding Area

| Observation Period | Observation dates | February 8 to March 27 |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Dawn-to-dusk days/hours | |
| | Total monitoring days/hours | |
| Eagle Identification | Male | Unbanded eagle in adult plumage. |
| | Female | USFWS band right leg, adult plumage. |

On March 25, nestwatchers found the 16 day-old eaglet dead in the nest. While the cause is unknown, circumstances indicate the eaglet may have succumbed to heat while being poorly shaded. During the period in which the eaglet died, temperatures climbed to over 80 degrees in less than a week. In addition, the adults switched their typical parental roles and the male was brooding 60% of the day. His inexperience in caring for small young, the unseasonably high temperatures, and the eaglet's inability to thermoregulate probably led to its death.

Human Activity.--Nestwatchers recorded 731 human activities at the Horseshoe BA (Appendix E, Table 15). Traffic (drivers/automobiles=532, OHV=28, dune buggy=2, cyclist=1) on FS Road 269 represented 77% (n=563) of all activity, and aircraft (small planes=128, helicopters=10, military jets=5) contributed to 19.6%. The remaining 3.4% (n=25) is of seven activity types.

Although there were high amounts of road traffic and aircraft, few people approached the nest area. Those that did came from a diverse background for a variety of reasons. Archaeologists entered the nest area to investigate stolen Native American artifacts. Javelina hunters traveled along Tangle Creek, and seven separate hiking groups from the Anasazi Youth Foundation walked along the creek. Hikers (n=3) and hunters (n=1) caused eagles to flush four times. Helicopters (n=1), military jets (n=1), and researchers (n=2) also caused significant reactions by the eagles.

Human activity from the Anasazi Youth Foundation was recorded for the first time in 1998. The foundation provides guidance to troubled youths through wilderness experiences and survival skills. They traditionally travel down Tangle Creek in January, but were delayed due to poor weather. Nestwatchers recorded them in the nest area on seven different occasions (four times within 200m/600ft) between March 7 and 24. Nestwatchers contacted the coordinators three times to explain how their activities could be compatible with the breeding pair. However, discussions generated little cooperation.

Food Habits.--Nestwatchers recorded only a few (n=16) prey deliveries (Appendix E, Table 16). The male delivered 14 prey items (87.5%), while the female brought 2 items to the nest (12.5%). Fish represented the most common prey type (75.0%). Prey items identified were channel catfish (n=4), black crappie (n=1), and bass (n=1). Nestwatchers recorded no foraging attempts.

| Arizona Game and Fish Department | April 1999 |
|---|------------|
| NGTR 139: Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1998 Summary Report | Page 12 |

Management Activities.--1. We contacted the Anasazi Youth Foundation by telephone and discussed the conflict between their hiking routes and the eagles. 2. We contacted the Cave Creek Ranger District, Tonto National Forest and informed them about the Foundation's use of the nest area. We requested a stipulation to avoid the nest area by a half mile be inserted into any future special use permit.

| Ladders Breeding Area | <u>a</u> | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Observation Period | Observation dates | February 7 to June 2 |
| | Dawn-to-dusk days/hours | |
| | Total monitoring days/hours | |
| Eagle Identification | Male | Unbanded eagle in adult plumage. |
| | Female | Unbanded eagle in adult plumage. |

The Ladders pair fledged three eaglets for the first time since 1972. One eaglet fell from the nest on May 2 (See Intervention Section) and was returned in good health the following day.

Human Activity.--Nestwatchers recorded 431 human activities (Appendix F, Table17). Watercraft (kayaks, canoes, and rafts) and aircraft (small planes and helicopters) comprised the bulk (96.5%) of all recorded activity. Other activity types were hikers (n=4), researchers (n=4), agency workers (n=3), ranchers (n=1), bicyclists (n=1), hunters (n=1), and an angler (n=1).

Because of the high river flows, 222 groups of boaters (representing 625 individual craft) floated through the nest area. River use was highest in March (89 boats) and April (73 boats). A variety of watercraft floated through the area: 290 kayaks, 143 personal inflatable rafts, 83 canoes, 80 rafts, and 29 catamarans. Nestwatchers recorded boaters disembarking within the closure on eight occasions. While the eagles commonly paid attention to the watercraft (206 watched responses), in only one instance did the eagles leave the area.

*Food Habits.--*Nestwatchers observed eagles foraging 11 times between river kilometers 162.6 and 163.2 (Appendix F, Table 18). The male foraged eight times and the female three. Nine attempts were successful. Ten of the 11 foraging attempts were for fish; five were catfish. The sole foraging attempt for mammals was the retrieval of a dead ringtail cat from the river.

Nestwatchers recorded 102 prey deliveries to the nest (Appendix F, Table 19). Fish represented the most common prey type (n=88), followed by mammals (n=6), birds (n=4), and unknowns (n=4). Prey identified in the nest were channel catfish (n=14), suckers (n=6), and a ringtail cat (n=1) (Table 20).

Management Activities.--1. The Prescott and Coconino national forests closed an area surrounding the nest.

| Arizona Game and Fish Department | April 1999 |
|---|------------|
| NGTR 139: Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1998 Summary Report | Page 13 |

| Luna Breeding Area | | |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Observation Period | Observation dates | April 3 to June 21 |
| | Dawn-to-dusk days/hours | 20 days/270 hours |
| | Total monitoring days/hours | 59 days/563 hours |
| Eagle Identification | Male Black VID band left leg - USFWS band | l right leg, adult plumage. |
| | Female Black VID band left leg - USFWS band | l right leg, adult plumage. |

Human Activity.--Nestwatchers recorded 47 human activities in the new USFS closure (Appendix G, Table 21). Aircraft (small planes and military jets) represented 59.6% (n=28) of all activity recorded. The remaining 19 terrestrial activities were agency workers (n=7), hikers (n=5), researchers (n=3), gunshots (n=1), boaters (n=1), anglers (n=1), and a birder (n=1).

The eagles flushed in response to six activities: agency workers (n=2), researchers (n=2), boaters (n=1), and an angler (n=1). Recreation resource managers maintaining a water pump in the closure flushed eagles twice. Nestwatchers contacted the agency workers and advised them of the least disturbing route to the pump. We flushed the eagles twice while banding the eagles and searching for the fledged eaglets.

Although nestwatchers recorded only 47 human activities inside the closure, a wealth of human activity occurred around the nest area. This activity originated from boating, angling, and camping at the lake, the town of Alpine, and highway 180. May was the most heavily recreated month for boats (n=23, May 2), vehicles in the parking lot (n=32, May 23), and people on the shoreline (n=71, May 23).

Food Habits.--Nestwatchers observed 54 foraging attempts (Appendix G, Table 22). The eagles were successful 34 times, unsuccessful 17 times, and had an unknown outcome 3 times. Birds were taken the most (n=25), followed by fish (n=18), mammals (n=1), and unknowns (n=10). Forty-six foraging attempts occurred within the wildlife closure on the west side of Luna Lake. Nestwatchers saw 53 prey deliveries of two types, birds (n=21) and fish (n=19) (Appendix G, Table 23). The only two species distinguished were American coot (n=18) and trout (n=19) (Appendix G, Table 24).

Management Activities.--1. Nestwatchers posted fliers and distributed them to the campground hosts and the public at the observation point. The fliers described the sensitive nature of nesting eagles and how the public can help. 2. The USFS created a legal closure around the nest along the north side of the lake. 3. The USFS posted signs along a fence separating the campground from the nest area. The signs informed the public that their presence could affect the eagles. 4. Due to the unusual circumstances surrounding juvenile mortality in the last two years, we kept nestwatchers at the site well into the post-fledging portion of the breeding season. 5. We established the nestwatcher's observation point at the parking lot near the boat ramp so they could inform and educate the public about the eagles. 6. The USFS, Alpine Ranger District, closed access to Group Site A at the campground until the eaglets fledged.

| Arizona Game and Fish Department | April 1999 |
|---|------------|
| NGTR 139: Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1998 Summary Report | Page 14 |

| Pleasant Breeding Are | <u>ea</u> | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Observation Period | Observation dates | February 8 to May 10 |
| | Dawn-to-dusk days/hours | |
| | Total monitoring days/hours | 69 days/754 hours |
| Eagle Identification | Male Blue VID band left leg - USI | FWS band right leg, adult plumage. |
| | Female | Unbanded eagle in adult plumage. |

*Human Activity.--*Nestwatchers recorded 434 human activities within the closure (Appendix H, Table 25). Watercraft (boats, jet-skis, and official boats) was the predominant activity (94.2%). Nestwatchers recorded no activities, other than banding the eaglets, which caused a significant response (restless, flush, or left area).

Nestwatchers documented the number of watercraft approaching the southern boundary and their compliance (Appendix H, Table 26). A total of 7324 boats and 826 jet-skis approached the closure and an additional 67 official boats approached and entered the closure to patrol the area. The 8217 watercraft doubled the 3928 nestwatchers recorded in 1997 (Beatty and others 1998). However, 4% non-compliance to the closure in 1998 is similar to 5% from 1994 to 1996 (Beatty and others 1995a, 1995b, 1997) and dissimilar to 12% noncompliance in 1997 (Beatty and others 1998).

As expected, the behavior of people inside the closure was positive and negative. There were those apologetic and interested in the eagles, whereas others were angry, provided a poor excuses or were verbally abusive. Jet-ski riders and anglers were the most frequent violators. Some jet-skis sped up and down the closure boundary line reading each "no-entry" buoy before racing into the closure and past the nestwatchers. Anglers often tried to sneak past the nestwatchers monitoring the boundary. Once the anglers discovered the nestwatchers trying to contact them, they would often speed away toward the lake or further into the closure.

*Food Habits.--*Nestwatchers observed 39 foraging attempts in the nest area (Appendix H, Table 27). The male and the female foraged 20 and 17 times, respectively. On two occasions, they hunted in tandem for waterfowl. The eagles were successful 17 of 23 times at capturing fish. They were unsuccessful in their attempts to pirate prey from a great blue heron or to capture waterfowl.

Nestwatchers saw 50 prey deliveries to the nest (Appendix H, Table 28). The male delivered an overwhelming portion of the prey (84%). Fish comprised 66% of the prey delivered, followed by birds (8%), mammals (6%), and unknown items (20%). Prey items identified were largemouth bass (n = 14), bluegill (n = 5), channel catfish (n = 2), white bass (n = 1), black crappie (n = 1), shad (n = 1), American coot (n = 3), and squirrels (n = 2) (Appendix H, Table 29).

Management activities.--1. Maricopa County Parks and AGFD placed closure signs (developed by Nongame Branch and purchased with Heritage Funds) at boat ramps and at roads entering the nest area. 2. Maricopa County Parks and Recreation marked the closure with buoys at the northern and southern boundaries. 3. We stationed nestwatchers at the closure's southern buoy boundary on

| Arizona Game and Fish Department | April 1999 |
|---|------------|
| NGTR 139: Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1998 Summary Report | Page 15 |

weekends and every other Friday to educate recreationists about eagles and contact violators entering the closure's boundary. 4. Two television news stations broadcast three segments to help educate the public about the eagles and the closure.

| 76 Breeding Area | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Observation Period | Observation dates | February 13 to June 3 |
| | Dawn-to-dusk days/hours | |
| | Total monitoring days/hours | |
| Eagle Identification | Male | USFWS band on left leg, adult plumage. |
| | Female | Unbanded eagle in adult plumage. |

Human Activity.--Nestwatchers recorded few human activities (Appendix I, Table 30). They saw 14 activities of 9 different activity types. Typically, we expect to see javelina hunters and ranchers wander through the closure a time or two during the season, however, watercraft floating down Tonto Creek is always unusual. Nestwatchers recorded a rafter and a canoe this year, reflecting the high rainfall and riverflow central Arizona waterways received. The only significant response recorded was a flushed response when we banded the nestlings.

*Food Habits.--*Nestwatchers witnessed three foraging attempts in the nest area. The male was successful in one of two tries, and the female was observed once successfully pirating food from a common raven.

Nestwatchers recorded the eagles arriving at the nest 58 times with prey (Appendix I, Table 31). The male delivered 69% (n=40) of all the observed prey. Fish made up 67.2% of the prey types, followed by mammals (6.9%), birds (1.7%), and unknowns (24.1%). Prey identified in the nest were carp (n=7), channel catfish (n=2), and a cottontail rabbit (n=1) (Appendix I, Table 32).

Management Activities.--1. The Tonto National Forest closed an area surrounding the nest. 2. Representative Richard Kyle was our guest when we banded the nestlings.

| Sycamore Breeding An | rea | |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Observation Period | Observation date | February 6 to June 3 |
| | Dawn-to-dusk days/hours | |
| | Total monitoring days/hours | |
| Eagle Identification | Male Blue VID band left leg - US | FWS band right, adult plumage. |
| 0 | Female Blue VID band left leg - US | FWS band right, adult plumage. |

Human Activity.--Nestwatchers recorded a large (n=570) and diverse (15 types) amount of human activity (Appendix J, Table 33). Aircraft (small planes and helicopters) comprised 63.9% (n=364) of all recorded activity.

Before the 1998 breeding season, Fort McDowell Indian Community made land management changes benefiting eagles. The entire reservation was closed to non-tribal members, and they hired their own police force. Nestwatcher's safety and eagle awareness prompted a meeting between AGFD, tribal police, and operators of the Pira del Sol recreation area. Consequently, Pira del Sol horseback tours avoided nest locations and tribal police increased their patrols in nest areas. Additionally, we gave nestwatchers cellular telephones to contact tribal police to report violators.

Terrestrial activities cause the most response from the eagles. Twenty-five activities caused the eagles to be restless (n=3), flush (n=14), or leave the area (n=8). Activity centered around a "beach area" gravel bar to the north (river kilometers 10.6 to 10.8), across the river (river kilometers. 9.5 to 9.8), and occasionally along dirt roads around the nest. The activities causing a significant response were drivers (n=8), commercial rafters (n=4), and OHVs (n=4).

*Food Habits.--*Nestwatchers observed 11 foraging attempts in the nest area between river kilometers 9.3 and 9.6, and one each at river kilometers 9.0 and 10.4 (Appendix J, Table 34). The twelve foraging attempts for fish were successful.

Nestwatchers saw the eagles arrive at the nest with 72 prey items (Appendix J, Table 35). The female delivered 46 items, while the male delivered 26. Prey types delivered were fish (n=57), birds (n=6), mammals (n=2), and unknowns (n=7). Prey items nestwatchers identified in the nest were suckers (n=24), rainbow trout (n=13), carp (n=11), American coot (n=2), ducks (n=1), and squirrels (n=2) (Appendix J, Table 36).

Management Activities.--1. A meeting between AGFD and Fort McDowell before the breeding season helped educate Tribal police about eagles and the nestwatcher's duties. 2. Fort McDowell restricted non-tribal use of the river area.

Tonto Breeding Area

| Observation Period C | Observation dates | February 7 to May 10 |
|------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Γ | Dawn-to-dusk days/hours | 35 days/440 hours |
| · 1 | Total monitoring days/hours | 69 days/698 hours |
| Eagle Identification N | Male Blue VID band left leg - USFWS ba | and right, adult plumage. |
| F | Female Blue VID band left leg - USFWS b | and right, adult plumage. |

Human Activity.--Nestwatchers recorded 171 human activities (Appendix K, Table 37). Aircraft (small planes, helicopters, and jets) represented 95.9% (n=164) of all activities. Rain and the inability to traverse A-cross road until mid-April reduced the amount of terrestrial activity. Additionally, the location of the nestwatcher's observation point (same elevation as the nest) made it difficult to detect ground activity.

Eagles responded significantly to four activities. Low flying planes caused a restless response three times. The adult eagles also flushed, circled, and vocalized during banding.

| Arizona Game and Fish Department | April 1999 |
|---|------------|
| NGTR 139: Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1998 Summary Report | Page 17 |

Food Habits.--Nestwatchers recorded 84 prey deliveries (Appendix K, Table 38). The male delivered 69% (n=58) of the prey to the nest. Prey types identified in the nest were fish (n=16) and birds (n=3). Nestwatchers classified most prey types as unknown (74.0%) and could not identify any prey to species due to a limited view from their observation point.

Management Activities.--1. Nestwatchers gave an eagle presentation to the local elementary school and wrote an article for the local newspaper.

| Tower Breeding Area | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Observation Period | Observation dates | February 6 to May 20 |
| | Dawn-to-dusk days | |
| | Total monitoring days/hours | |
| Eagle Identification | MalePurple VID band left leg - U | JSFWS band right, adult plumage. |
| | Female | . Unbanded eagle in adult plumage. |

Human Activity.--Aircraft (n=103) and railroad activity (n=262) were the more common of the 403 activities nestwatchers recorded (Appendix L, Table 39). Small planes (n=97), helicopters (n=6), tourist/cargo trains (n=149), and railroad maintenance vehicles (n=113) represented 90.6% of all recorded human activity. The remaining 38 human activities were of 11 activity types.

While nestwatchers recorded a great deal of human activity, only four instances caused the eagles to respond significantly. Railroad traffic caused eagles to flush twice, and a small plane flushed an eagle once. Although railroad activity was present on a daily basis, the consistent nature of the activity and distance from the nest caused eagles to do little more than just watch (n=169). Our banding activities caused the eagles to flush.

Food Habits.--Nestwatchers recorded 18 foraging attempts (11 times successful) between river kilometers 247.0 and 249.5 (Appendix L, Table 40). The male foraged 6 times, the female 11 times, and an unidentified Tower resident once. Fish (n=16), a bird (n=1), and an unknown item (n=1) were the prey types eagles tried to capture.

Nestwatchers observed 69 prey deliveries (Appendix L, Table 41). The male delivered 58% (n=40) of all the prey, where 73.9% (n=51) were fish. Birds (n=6), mammals (n=2), and unknowns (n=10) represented the remaining deliveries. Prey items nestwatchers identified in the nest were suckers (n=10), carp (n=2), and an American coot (n=2) (Appendix L, Table 42).

Management Activities.--1. The Coconino National Forest closed an area, posted signs, and locked gates at access points surrounding the nest area.

LITERATURE CITED

- Beatty, G.L., J.T. Driscoll, and J.G. Koloszar. 1995b. Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1995 summary report. Nongame and Endangered Wildlife Program Technical Report Number 85. Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Beatty, G.L., J.T. Driscoll, and J.G. Koloszar. 1997. Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1996 summary report. Nongame and Endangered Wildlife Program Technical Report Number 117. Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Beatty, G.L., J.T. Driscoll, and J.G. Koloszar. 1998. Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1997 summary report. Nongame and Endangered Wildlife Program Technical Report Number 131. Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Beatty, G. L., J.T. Driscoll and M.C. Siemens. 1995a. Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1994 Summary Report. Nongame and Endangered Wildlife Program Technical Report, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Brown D.E. (ed.). 1982. Biotic communities of the American Southwest United States and Mexico. University of Arizona. Desert Plants 4:1-342.
- Hunt, W.G., D.E. Driscoll, E.W. Bianchi, and R.E. Jackman. 1992. Ecology of bald eagles in Arizona. Volumes A-F. Report to U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Contract 6-CS-30-04470. Biosystems Analysis, Inc., Santa Cruz, California.
- Merriam, C.H. 1898. Life-zones and crop-zones of the United States. USDA, Division of Biological Survey.
- Postupalsky, S. 1974. Raptor reproductive success: some problems with methods, criteria and terminology. *in* F.N. Hammerstrom, B.E. Harrell and R.R. Olendorff, eds. Management of Raptors. Proceedings of the Conference on Raptor Conservation Techniques. Raptor Research Report 2:21-31.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1982. Bald eagle recovery plan (southwestern population). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1995. Endangered and Threatened Species: Bald Eagle Reclassification; Final Rule. Federal Register. Volume 60, No. 133. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

| Table 1. Arizor | na bald eag | le produ | ctivity for 199 | 8. | | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|---|--|--------------|------------------------------------|
| Breeding Area | BA Status ¹ | Nest # ² | Incubation Date | # Eggs | Hatch Date | # Young | # Fledged | Fledge Date |
| Alamo | F | 4 | 2/20-3/1 | 1+ | Failed 2 | 2/21 to 3/14 | , eaglets m | ay have hatched |
| Bartlett* | S | 2 | 1/5-22 | 2+ | 2/22 | 2 | 2 | 5/14 & 15 |
| Becker | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Blue Point | F | 7 | 1/6-28 | 1+ | Failed 1/28 to 2/23 | | | |
| Box Bar* | S | 2 | 1/14-26 | 2+ | - 2/23 | 2 | 2 | 5/18 & 23 |
| Camp Verde | U | | | | | | | |
| Canyon | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Cedar Basin | F | 3 | <4/3 | 1+ | | Failed bet | ween 4/3 ar | nd 5/15 |
| Cibecue | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Cliff | 0 | | | | | | | - |
| Coldwater | F | 8 | < 3/25 | 1+ | Failed 3/25 to 4/18, eaglets may have hatched | | | |
| Coolidge | F | 2 | 2/10-3/2 | 2 | Failed 3/13, injured male, female abandoned incubation – raven ate eggs | | | |
| Devil's Post | U | | | | | | | |
| Doka* | S | 1 | < 1/5 | 1+ | 1/17 -2/24 | 1 | 1 | 4/25 |
| Dupont | S | 2 | 1/28-3/2 | 1+ | 3/2-4/3 | 1 | 1 | >6/12 |
| East Verde | F | 6 | 1/27-3/2 | 2+ | Faile | d 3/2-4/8, o | eaglets may | have hatched |
| Ft. McDowell* | F | 16 | 1/5-27 | 2+ | 2/12 | 2 | One died | l 3/2-5, blind eaglet died 4/11 |
| Horse Mesa | F | 4 | 1/6-28 | 1+ | | Failed bet | ween 3/25 a | and 4/3 |
| Horseshoe* | F | 11 | 1/27-2/8 | 2 | 3/9 | 1 | Ea | glet died 3/25 |
| Ive's Wash | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Ladders* | S | 3 | 1/27-2/6 | 3+ | 3/3-5 | 3 | 3 | 5/17 & 5/23 |
| Lone Pine | 0 | | | | | | • | |
| Luna* | S | 1 | < 2/19 | 1+ | < 3/18 | 1 | 1 | 5/22 |
| Mule Hoof | U | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | <u>. </u> | | |
| Orme | S | 1 | 1/28-2/27 | 1+ | <4/3 | 1 | 1 | 5/29-6/12 |

APPENDIX A: 1998 BALD EAGLE REPRODUCTION SUMMARIES

¹Breeding area status codes (Postapulsky 1974) - U=unoccupied, O=occupied, S=successful, F=failed.

²Nest numbers are from Hunt and others 1992, and SRP's bald eagle nesting areas in Arizona atlas.

*= Sites monitored by 1998 Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program.

Arizona Game and Fish DepartmentApril 1999NGTR 139: Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1998 Summary ReportPage 20

| Table 1. continu | ed | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|-------------|--------------|---------------------------|--|--|
| Breeding Area | B.A. Status ¹ | Nest # ² | Incubation Date | # Eggs | Hatch Date | # Young | # Fledged | Fledge Date | | |
| Perkinsville | 0 | | | Nes | t #3 fell betw | een 1/27 an | d 3/2 | | | |
| Pinal | 0 | | | | | | | | | |
| Pinto | 0 | | | | | | | | | |
| Pleasant* | S | 2 | 1/5-25 | 1+ | 2/26 | 1 | 1 | 5/17 | | |
| Redmond | S | 5 | 1/28-3/2 | 2 | 3/11-4/3 | 2 | 1 | >6/12, 1 died 4/21-5/7 | | |
| San Carlos | S | 2 | 1/6-28 | 2+ | 2/10-3/2 | 2 | 2 | 5/11-5/13 | | |
| 76* | S | 3 | 2/14 | 2+ | 3/21 | 2 | 2 | >6/12 | | |
| Sheep | 0 | | | | | | | | | |
| Sycamore* | S | 2 | 1/5-27 | 1+ | ~ 2/27 | 1 | 1 | 5/30 | | |
| Table Mountain | F | 4 | 3/2-3/25 | 1+ | | Failed betv | veen 3/25 a | nd 4/17 | | |
| Talkalai | 0 | | | | | | | | | |
| Tonto* | S | 2 | 1/6-23 | 1+ | 2/24-25 | 1 | 1 | 5/13-6/9 | | |
| Tower* | S | 8 | 1/27-2/6 | 2+ | 3/2-5 | 2 | 2 | 5/2-6/1 | | |
| Winkelman* | 0 | | | | | | | | | |

Σ,

¹Breeding area status codes (Postapulsky 1974) - U=unoccupied, O=occupied, S=successful, F=failed. ²Nest numbers are from Hunt and others 1992, and SRP's bald eagle nesting areas in Arizona atlas. *= Sites monitored by 1998 Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program.

| Table 2. Arizona bald eagle productivity summary for 1998. | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|---------------------------------|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| Number of Breeding Areas | 39 | Number of Active Breeding Areas | 24 | | | | | |
| Number of Occupied Breeding Areas | 36 | Number of Failed Nests | 10 | | | | | |
| Number of Eggs | 38+ | Number of Successful Nests | 14 | | | | | |
| Nest Success = $14/36$ | 0.39 | Number of Young Hatched | 25+ | | | | | |
| | 1.5 | Number of Young Fledged | 21 | | | | | |
| Mean Brood Size = $21/14$ 1.5Productivity = 0.39×1.5 0.5 | | | | | | | | |

| Table 3. Observed | human activity and | l bald eagle behavio | r, Bartlett BA, AZ, | 1998. | |
|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------|------------|
| Туре | \mathbf{N}^1 | W | R | F | Total |
| Agency Worker | 9 | - | - | - | 9 (6.0%) |
| Birder | 7 | | - | - | 7 (4.6%) |
| Canoe/Kayak | 18 | 17 | - | - · | 35 (23.3%) |
| Driver | 2 | - | - | 1 | 3 (2.0%) |
| Fisherman | 5 | 1 | - | - | 6 (4.0%) |
| Helicopter | 15 | 10 | - | - | 25 (16.7%) |
| Hiker | 6 | - | - | - | 6 (4.0%) |
| Jet | - | 2 | - | - | 2 (1.3%) |
| OHV | 2 | - | - | - | 2 (1.3%) |
| Photographer | 1 | - | - | - | 1 (0.6%) |
| Rafter | 7 | 5 | - | - | 12 (8.0%) |
| Small Plane | 29 | 12 | 1 | - | 42 (28.0%) |
| Total | 101 | 47 | 1 | 1 | 150 (100%) |

APPENDIX B: BARTLETT BREEDING AREA SUMMARIES

¹Eagle behavior, N = none, W = watched, R = restless, F = flushed.

| Table 4. Observed foraging events and success, Bartlett BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|------------------|---|-----|----|------|--|--|--|--|
| Fish Unknown Total | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sex | \mathbf{E}^1 | S-U ² | E | S-U | Е | S-U | | | | |
| Male | 10 | 8-2 | 5 | 1-4 | 15 | 9-6 | | | | |
| Female | 3 | 3-0 | - | _ | 3 | 3-0 | | | | |
| Total | 13 | 11-2 | 5 | 1-4 | 18 | 12-6 | | | | |

 ${}^{1}E = A$ single foraging event for a food item, not the amount of strikes to capture an item.

²S-U=Successful - unsuccessful captures of prey.

Arizona Game and Fish Department NGTR 139: Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1998 Summary Report

April 1999 Page 22

| Table 5. Observed prey types delivered to nest, Bartlett BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|----------|----------|---------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| Sex | Fish | Mammals | Birds | Unknown | Total | | | | |
| Male | 84 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 93 (75.6%) | | | | |
| Female | 24 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 30 (24.4%) | | | | |
| Total | 108 (87.8%) | 4 (3.3%) | 3 (2.4%) | 8(6.5%) | 123 (100%) | | | | |

| Table 6. | Table 6. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, Bartlett BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|--|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|-----|-------|
| Sex | LB ¹ | BC | BG | S | С | CC | SF | UF | G | AC | SQ | WC | UM | Unk | Total |
| Male | 10 | 7 | 2 | 19 | 1 | 13 | 1 | 31 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 93 |
| Female | - | 2 | - | 8 | - | 6 | - | 8 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | 4 | 30 |
| Total | 10 | 9 | 2 | 27 | 1 | 19 | 1 | 39 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 123 |

¹Prey items, LB = largemouth bass, BC = black crappie, BG = bluegill, S = suckers, C = carp, CC = channel catfish, SF = sunfish, UF = unknown fish, G = grebes, AC = American Coot, SQ = squirrels, WC = western cottontail, UM = unknown mammals, Unk = unknown.

| Table 7. Observed | Table 7. Observed human activity and bald eagle behavior, Box Bar BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|----|----|----|---|---|----|-------------|--|--|
| Туре | N ¹ | w | R | F | L | В | U | Total | | |
| Agency worker | 1 | - | 2 | 2 | - | - | 1 | 6 (2.5%) | | |
| Angler | 4 | ł | - | - | - | - | 1 | 5 (2.1%) | | |
| Camper | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 (0.4%) | | |
| Canoe/Kayak | 13 | 5 | - | - | - | - | 3 | 21 (8.7%) | | |
| Cattle | 2 | - | _ | - | - | - | - | 2 (0.8%) | | |
| Construction | - | - | 2 | - | _ | - | - | 2 (0.8%) | | |
| Driver | 3 | 4 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 8 (3.3%) | | |
| Helicopter | 20 | 11 | 1 | 2 | - | - | 8 | 42 (17.4%) | | |
| Hiker | _ | 2 | 1 | 4 | - | - | 2 | 9 (3.7%) | | |
| Horseback rider | 8 | 5 | 1 | 3 | - | - | 6 | 23 (9.5%) | | |
| OHV | 3 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 1 | - | - | 18 (7.5%) | | |
| Shooter | 2 | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | 4 (1.7%) | | |
| Small plane | 52 | 28 | 2 | 1 | - | 2 | 15 | 100 (41.5%) | | |
| Total | 109 | 65 | 10 | 16 | 1 | 2 | 38 | 241 (100%) | | |

APPENDIX C: BOX BAR BREEDING AREA SUMMARIES

¹Eagle behavior, N=none, W=watched, R=restless, F=flushed, L=left area, B=birds not in area, U=unknown. ²D-D total=Observations on dawn-to-dusk days.

| Table 8. | Table 8. Vehicles along FS Road 160 entering the Box Bar BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|------|----------|------|----------|------|----------|------|----------|------|----------|
| Date | Vehicles | Date | Vehicles | Date | Vehicles | Date | Vehicles | Date | Vehicles | Date | Vehicles |
| 2/7 | 20 | 2/28 | 57 | 3/14 | 6 | 4/11 | 59 | 4/26 | 98 | 5/23 | 41 |
| 2/10 | 1 | 3/1 | 68 | 3/21 | 47 | 4/12 | 112 | 5/2 | 44 | 5/24 | 45 |
| 2/12 | 1 | 3/7 | 4 | 3/22 | 62 | 4/18 | 67 | 5/3 | 80 | | |
| 2/22 | 39 | 3/8 | 56 | 4/4 | 58 | 4/19 | 77 | 5/9 | 48 | 1322 | Vehicles |
| 2 /27 | 10 | 3/13 | 3 | 4/5 | 116 | 4/25 | 45 | 5/10 | 58 | | |

Arizona Game and Fish DepartmentApril 1999NGTR 139: Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1998 Summary ReportPage 24

| Table 9. Observed foraging events and success, Box Bar BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|------------------|------|------|-------|------|--|--|--|--|
| | F | ish | Unkr | IOWN | Total | | | | | |
| Sex | E ¹ | S-U ² | Е | S-U | Е | S-U | | | | |
| Male | 13 | 13-0 | 1 | 1-0 | 14 | 14-0 | | | | |
| Female | 21 | 19-2 | 2 | 2-0 | 23 | 21-2 | | | | |
| Total | 34 | 32-2 | 3 | 3-0 | 37 | 35-2 | | | | |

 ${}^{1}E = A$ single foraging event for a food item, not the amount of strikes to capture an item. ${}^{2}S-U = Successful - unsuccessful captures of prey.$

| Table 10. Observed prey types delivered to nest, Box Bar BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|----------|------------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Sex | Fish | Mammals | Unknown | Total | | | | | |
| Male | 31 | 1 | 15 | 47 (44.3%) | | | | | |
| Female | 40 | 1 | 17 | 58 (54.7%) | | | | | |
| Unknown | 1 | - | - | 1 (0.9%) | | | | | |
| Total | 72 (67.9%) | 2 (1.8%) | 32 (30.2%) | 106 (100%) | | | | | |

| Table 11. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, Box Bar BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|--|--|
| Sex S ¹ BC LB C UC R RT Total | | | | | | | | | | |
| Both Adults | 23 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 40 | | |

¹Prey items, S=suckers, BC=black crappie, LB=largemouth bass, C=carp, UC=unknown catfish, R=rats, RT=rabbits

| Table 12. Observed | human activity | y and bald eagl | e behavior, Ft. | McDowell BA | , AZ, 1998. | | |
|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------|--|
| Туре | N^1 | W | R | F | D-D total ² | Total | |
| Agency workers | - | - | - | 5 | 3 (1.2%) | 5 (1.4%) | |
| Boater | - | 1 | - | - | 1 (0.4%) | 1 (0.3%) | |
| Drivers | 1 | 14 | - | 4 | 12 (5.0%) | 19 (5.1%) | |
| Fishermen | - | 1 | 1 | - | 2 (0.8%) | 2 (0.5%) | |
| Gunshots | 11 | 4 | - | - | 11 (4.6%) | 15 (4.1%) | |
| Helicopters | 21 | 24 | - | 2 | 10 (4.1%) | 47 (12.7%) | |
| Military jets | - | 1 | - | - | 1 (0.4%) | 1 (0.3%) | |
| OHV | - | 4 | - | - | 3 (1.2%) | 4 (1.1%) | |
| Picnickers | - | 1 | - | - | 0 | 1 (0.3%) | |
| Small planes | 211 | 58 | - | 1 | 196 (81.3%) | 270 (73.2%) | |
| Woodcutter | 4 | - | - | - | 2 (0.8%) | 4 (1.1%) | |
| Total | 248 | 108 | 1 | 12 | 241 (100%) | 369 (100%) | |

APPENDIX D: FT. MCDOWELL BREEDING AREA SUMMARIES

¹Eagle behavior, N = none, W = watched, R = restless, F = flushed.

²D-D total=Observations on dawn-to-dusk days.

| Table 13. Observed prey types delivered to the nest, Ft. McDowell BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|----------|----------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Sex | Fish | Birds | Unknown | Total | | | | | | |
| Male | 25 | 2 | 2 | 29 (54.7%) | | | | | | |
| Female | 24 | - | - | 24 (45.3%) | | | | | | |
| Total | 49 (92.5%) | 2 (3.8%) | 2 (3.8%) | 53 (100%) | | | | | | |

| Table 14. O | Table 14. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, Ft. McDowell BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|----|---|---|----|--|--|--|--|
| Sex S ¹ CP CC UF UB Unk Total | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 13 | - | 1 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 29 | | | | |
| Female | 16 | 1 | - | 7. | - | - | 24 | | | | |
| Total | 29 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 2 | 2 | 53 | | | | |

¹Prey items, S=suckers, CP=carp, CC=channel catfish, UF=unknown fish, UB=unknown birds, Unk=unknown.

| Table 15. Observed hur | nan activity | and bald | eagle behav | ior, Horse | shoe BA, A | Z 1998. | |
|------------------------|----------------|----------|-------------|------------|------------|------------------------|-------------|
| Туре | \mathbf{N}^1 | w | R | F | U | D-D total ² | Total |
| Archaeologist | - | 1 | - | - | - | 0 | 1 (0.1%) |
| Canoe/Kayak | 3 | 1 | - | - | - | 3 (0.6%) | 4 (0.5%) |
| Cattle | - | - | - | • | 2 | 2 (0.4%) | 2 (0.3%) |
| Cyclist | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 (0.2%) | 1 (0.1%) |
| Driver (automobile) | 151 | 348 | - | | 33 | 366 (74.1%) | 532 (72.8%) |
| Dune Buggy | 1 | 1 | - | - | + | 0 | 2 (0.3%) |
| Gunshots | - | 2 | - | - | - | 0 | 2 (0.3%) |
| Helicopter | - | 6 | - | 1 | 3 | 3 (0.6%) | 10 (1.4%) |
| Hiker | 1 | 5 | - | 3 | 3 | 1 (0.2%) | 12 (1.6%) |
| Hunter | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 (0.3%) |
| Military jet | - | 2 | 1 | - | 2 | 4 (0.8%) | 5 (0.7%) |
| OHV | 2 | 26 | - | - | - | 22 (4.5%) | 28 (3.8%) |
| Researcher | - | - | - | 2 | - | 0 | 2 (0.3%) |
| Small plane | 42 | 69 | - | - | 17 | 92 (18.6%) | 128 (17.5%) |
| Total | 200 | 461 | 1 | 7 | 62 | 494 (100%) | 731 (100%) |

APPENDIX E: HORSESHOE BREEDING AREA SUMMARIES

³Eagle behavior, N=none, W=watched, R=Restless, F=flushed, U=unknown. ²D-D total=Observations on dawn-to-dusk days.

| Table 16. Obs | Table 16. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, Horseshoe BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Sex CC ¹ BC B UF Unk Total | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 1 | - | 1 | 8 | 4 | 14 (87.5%) | | | | | |
| Female | 1 | 1 | - | _ | - | 2 (12.5%) | | | | | |
| Total | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 16 (100%) | | | | | |

¹Prey items, CC = channel catfish, BC = black crappie, B = unknown bass, UF = unknown fish, Unk = unknown.

| Table 17. Observed | human ac | tivity and | bald eagle | behavior, | Ladders H | BA, AZ, 1 | 998. | |
|--------------------|----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|-------------|
| Туре | N^1 | W | R | F | L | U | D-D total ² | Total |
| Agency worker | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 (0.6%) | 3 (0.7%) |
| Angler | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 (0.6%) | 1 (0.2%) |
| Bicyclist | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 (0.6%) | 1 (0.2%) |
| Helicopter | 2 | 10 | 1 | . 1 | 1 | - | 7 (2.1%) | 15 (3.5%) |
| Hiker | - | 3 | - | - | 1 | + | 3 (0.9%) | 4 (0.9%) |
| Hunter | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 0 | 1 (0.2%) |
| Rancher | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 (0.6%) | 1 (0.2%) |
| Researcher | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 2 (0.9%) | 4 (0.9%) |
| Small plane | 15 | 149 | 5 | - | - | 10 | 132 (40.7%) | 179 (41.5%) |
| Watercraft | 11 | 206 | - | - | 1 | 4 | 176 (54.3%) | 222 (51.5%) |
| Total | 28 | 374 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 324 (100%) | 431 (100%) |

APPENDIX F: LADDERS BREEDING AREA SUMMARIES

¹Eagle behavior, N=none, W=watched, R=restless, F=flushed, L=left area, U=unknown. ²D-D total=Observations on dawn-to-dusk days.

| Table 18. Observed foraging events and success, Ladders BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|------------------|---|-----|----|-----|--|--|--|--|
| Fish Mammal Total | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sex | E | S-U ² | E | S-U | E | S-U | | | | |
| Male | 3 | 3-0 | - | - | 3 | 3-0 | | | | |
| Female | 7 | 5-2 | 1 | 1-0 | 8 | 6-2 | | | | |
| Total | 10 | 8-2 | 1 | 1-0 | 11 | 9-2 | | | | |

.

 ${}^{1}E = A$ single foraging event for a food item, not the amount of strikes to capture an item. ${}^{2}S-U = Successful - unsuccessful captures of prey.$

| Table 19. Obser | Table 19. Observed prey types delivered to nest, Ladders BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|----------|----------|----------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Sex | Fish | Mammals | Birds | Unknown | Total | | | | | | |
| Male | 54 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 67 (65.7%) | | | | | | |
| Female | 32 | - | 1 | - | 33 (32.4%) | | | | | | |
| Unknown | 2 | - | - | - | 2 (2.0%) | | | | | | |
| Total | 88 (86.3%) | 6 (5.9%) | 4 (3.9%) | 4 (3.9%) | 102 (100%) | | | | | | |

| Table 20. Obse | Table 20. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, Ladders BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Sex S ¹ CC UF UB RC UM Unk Total | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Both Adults | Both Adults 6 14 68 4 1 5 4 102 | | | | | | | | | | |

¹Prey items, S=suckers, CC=channel catfish, UF=unknown fish, UB=unknown birds, RC=ringtail Cat, UM=unknown mammals, Unk=unknown.

| Table 21. Observe | d human activ | vity and bald ea | gle behavior, L | una BA, AZ, 1 | 998. | | |
|-------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|------|------------------------|------------|
| Туре | N ¹ | w | F | В | U | D-D total ² | Total |
| Agency Worker | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | _ | 1 (3.4%) | 7 (14.9%) |
| Birder | 1 | - | - | - | - | 0 | 1 (2.1%) |
| Boater | - | - | 1 | - | - | 0 | 1 (2.1%) |
| Fisherman | - | - | 1 | - | | 1 (3.4%) | 1 (2.1%) |
| Gunshot | 1 | - | - | - | | 1 (3.4%) | 1 (2.1%) |
| Hiker | 1 | 1 | - | 3 | - | 0 | 5 (10.6%) |
| Jet | - | 3 | - | 3 | 1 | 7 (24.1%) | 7 (14.9%) |
| Researcher | - | - | 2 | 1 | - | 2 (6.9%) | 3 (6.4%) |
| Small Plane | 6 | 5 | - | 6 | 4 | 17 (58.6%) | 21 (44.7%) |
| Total | 10 | 10 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 29 (100%) | 47 (100%) |

APPENDIX G: LUNA BREEDING AREA SUMMARIES

¹Eagle behavior, N=none, W=watched, F=flushed, B=bird not in area, U=unknown. ²D-D total=Observations on dawn-to-dusk days.

| Table 22. Ob | Table 22. Observed foraging events and success, Luna BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|--------------------|------|--------|-----|---------|----|---------|----|---------|--|--|
| | Bi | rds | Fish | | Mai | Mammals | | Unknown | | Total | | |
| Sex | E ¹ | S-U-? ² | E | S-U-? | E | S-U-? | E | S-U-? | E | S-U-? | | |
| Male | 16 | 10-5-1 | 7 | 5-2-0 | 1 | 1-0-0 | 2 | 0-2-0 | 26 | 16-9-1 | | |
| Female | 3 | 0-3-0 | 2 | 2-0-0 | - | - | 2 | 0-2-0 | 7 | 2-5-0 | | |
| Unknnown | 6 | 6-0-0 | 9 | 6-2-1 | - | - | 6 | 4-1-1 | 21 | 16-3-2 | | |
| Total | 25 | 16-8-1 | 18 | 13-4-1 | 1 | 1-0-0 | 10 | 4-5-1 | 54 | 34-17-3 | | |

 ${}^{1}E = A$ single foraging event for a food item, not the amount of strikes to capture an item. ${}^{2}S-U-? = Successful capture of prey - unsuccessful captures of prey - unknown outcome.$

| Arizona Game and Fish Department | April 1999 |
|---|------------|
| NGTR 139: Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program: 1998 Summary Report | Page 31 |

| Table 23. Observed prey types delivered to the nest, Luna BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|-----------------|------------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Sex | Birds | ds Fish Unknown | | Total | | | | | | |
| Male | 10 | 7 | 3 | 20 (37.7%) | | | | | | |
| Female | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 (11.3%) | | | | | | |
| Unknown | 9 | 11 | 7 | 27 (50.9%) | | | | | | |
| Total | 21 (39.6%) | 20 (37.7%) | 12 (22.6%) | 53 (100%) | | | | | | |

| Table 24. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, Luna BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|----|----|----|-----|-------|--|--|--|--|
| Sex | UT | UF | AC | UB | Unk | Total | | | | |
| Male | 6 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 20 | | | | |
| Female | 2 | - | 2 | - | 2 | 6 | | | | |
| Unknown | 11 | - | 7 | 2 | 7 | 27 | | | | |
| Total | 19 | 1 | 18 | 3 | 12 | 53 | | | | |

¹Prey items, UT=unknown trout, UF=unknown fish, AC=American Coot, UB=unknown birds, Unk=unknown.

| Table 25. Observed hu | uman activity and | d bald eagle behav | ior, Pleasant BA, | AZ, 1998. | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Туре | \mathbf{N}^1 | W | F | U | Total |
| Agency boats | - | - | - | 67 ² | 67 (15.4%) |
| Agency worker | - | - | 1 | - | 1 (0.2%) |
| Boats | - | - | + | 270 ² | 270 (62.2%) |
| Camper | 1 | - | - | - | 1 (0.2%) |
| Driver | 1 | - | - | _ | 1 (0.2%) |
| Hanglider | 0 | 1 | - | - | 1 (0.2%) |
| Helicopter | - | 2 | | 1 | 3 (0.7%) |
| Jet-ski | - | - | - | 72 ² | 72 (16.6%) |
| Small plane | 7 | 10 | - | 2 | 19 (4.4%) |
| Total | 9 | 13 | 1 | 411 | 434 (100%) |

APPENDIX H: PLEASANT BREEDING AREA SUMMARIES

ⁱEagle behavior, N = none, W = watched, F = flushed, U = unknown. ²No behavior recorded for watercraft that entered closure.

| Table 26. Watercraft compliance at southern buoy closure boundary, Pleasant BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|-----|-----|----|------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| Date | BAC ¹ | BIC | JAC | ЛС | OBIC | Total | | | | |
| February 7 to 15 | 543 | i3 | - | - | 2 | 558 | | | | |
| Feb. 20 to March 1 | 416 | 11 | 11 | - | 7 | 445 | | | | |
| March 7 to 15 | 675 | 20 | 24 | 2 | 3 | 724 | | | | |
| March 20 to 29 | 1167 | 28 | 59 | 4 | 8 | 1266 | | | | |
| April 4 to 12 | 1135 | 47 | 57 | 3 | 19 | 1261 | | | | |
| April 17 to 26 | 1360 | 50 | 217 | 20 | 14 | 1661 | | | | |
| May 1 to 10 | 1258 | 55 | 254 | 30 | 10 | 1607 | | | | |
| May 15 to 23 | 500 | 46 | 132 | 13 | 4 | 695 | | | | |
| Total | 7054 | 270 | 754 | 72 | 67 | 8217 | | | | |

¹BAC=boats at closure, BIC=boats inside closure, JAC=jet-skis at closure, JIC=jet-skis inside closure, OBIC= official boats inside closure.

| Table 27. Observed foraging events and success, Pleasant BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|------------------|----|------|-----|---------|----|-------|--|--|--|
| | Fish | | Bi | rds | Uni | Unknown | | Total | | | |
| Sex | E ¹ | S-U ² | E | S-U | E | S-U | E | S-U | | | |
| Male | 16 | 13-3 | 4 | 0-4 | - | - | 20 | 13-7 | | | |
| Female | 7 | 3-4 | 8 | 0-8 | 2 | 0-2 | 17 | 3-14 | | | |
| Both | - | - | 2 | 0-2 | - | - | 2 | 0-2 | | | |
| Total | 23 | 16-7 | 14 | 0-14 | 2 | 0-2 | 39 | 16-23 | | | |

 ${}^{1}E=A$ single foraging event for a food item, not the amount of strikes to capture an item. ${}^{2}S-U=Successful$ - unsuccessful captures of prey.

| Table 28. Observed prey types delivered to the nest, Pleasant BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|----------|----------|------------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Sex | Fish | Birds | Mammals | Unknown | Total | | | | | |
| Male | 28 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 42 (84.0%) | | | | | |
| Female | 5 | 3 | - | | 8 (16.0%) | | | | | |
| Total | 33 (66.0%) | 4 (8.0%) | 3 (6.0%) | 10 (20.0%) | 50 (100%) | | | | | |

| Table 29. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, Pleasant BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|-------|----|----|
| Sex | Sex LB ¹ BG CC WB BC SH UF AC SQ UM Unk Total | | | | | | | | | Total | | |
| Male | 13 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 42 |
| Female | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | ~ | 3 | 2 | - | - | - | 8 |
| Total | 14 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 50 |

¹Prey items, LB=largemouth bass, BG=bluegill, CC=channel catfish, WB=white bass, BC=black crappie, SH=shad, UF=unknown fish, AC=American coot, SQ=squirrels, UM=unknown mammals, Unk=unknown.

| Table 30. Observed human | n activity a | nd bald eag | le behavior | , 76 BA, A | Z, 1998. | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|------------|----------|------------------------|-----------|
| Туре | N^1 | W | F | В | U | D-D total ² | Total |
| Canoe/kayak | - | - | + | - | 1 | 1 (14.3%) | 1 (7.1%) |
| Helicopter | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | 2 (28.5%) | 2 (14.3%) |
| Hiker | 1 | - | - | - | - | 0 | 1 (7.1%) |
| Horseback rider/hunter | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 (14.3%) | 1 (7.1%) |
| Jet (military) | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 (14.3%) | 3 (21.4%) |
| Rafter | ~ | _ | - | - | 1 | 1 (14.3%) | 1 (7.1%) |
| Rancher | - | 1 | - | - | - | 0 | 1 (4.2%) |
| Researchers | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 (14.3%) | 1 (7.1%) |
| Small plane | 2 | - | - | 1 | - | 0 | 3 (21.4%) |
| Total | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 (100%) | 14 (100%) |

APPENDIX I: 76 BREEDING AREA SUMMARIES

¹Eagle behavior, N=none, W=watched, F=flushed, B=bird not in area, U=unknown. ²D-D total=Observations on dawn-to-dusk days.

| Table 31. Observed prey types delivered to the nest, 76 BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|----------|----------|------------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Sex Fish Birds Mammals Unknown Tota | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 28 | - | 4 | 8 | 40 (69.0%) | | | | | |
| Female | 11 | 1 | - | 6 | 18 (31.0%) | | | | | |
| Total | 39 (67.2%) | 1 (1.7%) | 4 (6.9%) | 14 (24.1%) | 58 (100%) | | | | | |

| Table 32. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, 76 BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-------|--|--|--|
| Sex | C ¹ | СС | UF | WC | UM | UB | Unk | Total | | | |
| Male | 6 | 2 | 20 | 1 | 3 | - | 8 | 40 | | | |
| Female | 1 | - | 10 | - | - | 1 | 6 | 18 | | | |
| Total | 7 | 2 | 30 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 14 | 58 | | | |

¹Prey items, C=carp, CC=channel catfish, UF=unknown fish, WC=western cottontail, UM=unknown mammal, UB=unknown bird, Unk=unknown.

| Table 33. Observed hu | man activ | vity and ba | uld eagle b | ehavior, S | Sycamore | BA, AZ, | 1998. | |
|-----------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|------------|----------|---------|------------------------|-------------|
| Туре | N ¹ | w | R | F | L | U | D-D total ² | Total |
| Agency worker | 0 | 1 | - | 2 | - | - | 1 (0.3%) | 3 (0.5%) |
| Angler | 8 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | 10 (2.8%) | 10 (1.8%) |
| Canoe | 3 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 4 (1.1%) | 4 (0.7%) |
| Driver | 26 | 9 | - | 6 | 2 | 5 | 46 (12.8%) | 48 (8.4%) |
| Gunshot | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | | 3 (0.8%) | 3 (0.5%) |
| Helicopter | 63 | 17 | 2 | - | - | 10 | 28 (7.8%) | 92 (16.1%) |
| Hiker | 7 | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | 6 (1.7%) | 9 (1.6%) |
| Horseback rider | 7 | 2 | - | - | - | - | 4 (1.1%) | 9 (1.6%) |
| OHV | 24 | 6 | - | 4 | - | - | 24 (6.7%) | 34 (6.0%) |
| Picnicker | 8 | 4 | - | 1 | - | - | 10 (2.8%) | 13 (2.3%) |
| Rafter | 26 | 5 | - | | 4 | 2 | 23 (6.4%) | 37 (6.5%) |
| Small plane | 227 | 20 | - | - | - | 25 | 171 (47.5%) | 272 (47.7%) |
| Swimmer | 4 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | 4 (1.1%) | 6 (1.1%) |
| Tribal police vehicle | 21 | 6 | - | 1 | - | - | 24 (6.7%) | 28 (4.9%) |
| Woodcutter | 0 | 2 | - | - | - | - | 2 (0.6%) | 2 (0.4%) |
| Total | 475 | 77 | 3 | 14 | 8 | 43 | 360 (100%) | 570 (100%) |

APPENDIX J: SYCAMORE BREEDING AREA SUMMARIES

¹Eagle behavior, N=none, W=watched, R=restless, F=flushed, L=left area, U=unknown. ²D-D total=Observations on dawn-to-dusk days.

| Table 34. Observed foraging events and success, Sycamore BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|------------------|---------|-----|-------|------|--|--|--|
| | Fish | | Unknown | | Total | | | | |
| Sex | E' | S-U ² | Е | S-U | E | S-U | | | |
| Male | 4 | 4-0 | - | - | 4 | 4-0 | | | |
| Female | 4 | 4-0 | - | - | 4 | 4-0 | | | |
| Unknown | 4 | 4-0 | 1 | 0-1 | 5 | 4-1 | | | |
| Total | 12 | 12-0 | 1 | 0-1 | 13 | 12-1 | | | |

 $^{1}E = A$ single foraging event for a food item, not the amount of strikes to capture an item. $^{2}S-U=Successful$ - unsuccessful captures of prev.

| 5-0-Succession | dibuccessiul captures of prey. | |
|----------------|--------------------------------|--|
| | | |
| | | |

| Table 35. Observed prey types delivered to the nest, Sycamore BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|----------|----------|----------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Sex | Fish | Bird | Mammal | Unknown | Total | | | | | |
| Male | 17 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 26 (36.1%) | | | | | |
| Female | 40 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 46 (63.9%) | | | | | |
| Total | 57 (79.2%) | 6 (8.3%) | 2 (2.8%) | 7 (9.7%) | 72 (100%) | | | | | |

| Table 36. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, Sycamore BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-------|
| Sex | S ¹ | RT | С | UF | AC | DK | UB | SQ | Unk | Total |
| Male | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 26 |
| Female | 19 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 46 |
| Total | 24 | 13 | 11 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 72 |

¹Prey items, S=suckers, RT=rainbow trout, C=carp, UF=unknown fish, AC=Amercian coot, DK=ducks UB=unknown bird, SQ=squirrel, Unk=unknown.

| Table 37. Observed human activity and bald eagle behavior, Tonto BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|----|---|---|------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|
| Туре | N ¹ | w | R | F | D-D total ² | Total | | | | |
| Helicopter | 11 | 5 | - | - | 7 (5.9%) | 16 (9.4%) | | | | |
| Military jet | 1 | - | - | - | 1 (0.8%) | 1 (0.6%) | | | | |
| Ranch dog | 3 | 1 | - | - | 3 (2.5%) | 4 (2.3%) | | | | |
| Rancher | • | 2 | - | - | 1 (0.8%) | 2 (1.2%) | | | | |
| Researcher | ~ | - | - | 1 | 1 (0.8%) | 1 (0.6%) | | | | |
| Small plane | 122 | 22 | 3 | - | 105 (89.0%) | 147 (86.0%) | | | | |
| Total | 137 | 30 | 3 | 1 | 118 (100%) | 171 (100%) | | | | |

APPENDIX K: TONTO BREEDING AREA SUMMARIES

¹Eagle behavior, N=none, W=watched, R=restless, F=flushed. ²D-D total=Observations on dawn-to-dusk days.

| Table 38. Observed prey types delivered to the nest, Tonto BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|----------|------------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Sex | Fish | Birds | Unknown | Total | | | | | |
| Male | 12 | 2 | 44 | 58 (69.0%) | | | | | |
| Female | 4 | - | 21 | 25 (29.8%) | | | | | |
| Unknown | - | 1 | - | 1 (1.2%) | | | | | |
| Total | 16 (19.0%) | 3 (3.6%) | 65 (77.4%) | 84 (100%) | | | | | |

.

| Table 39. Observed human activity and bald eagle behavior, Tower BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|---|----|------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|
| Туре | N ¹ | w | F | U | D-D total ² | Total | | | |
| Agency worker | 6 | 1 | - | - | 2 (0.8%) | 7 (1.7%) | | | |
| Angler | 1 | - | - | - | 1 (0.4%) | 1 (0.2%) | | | |
| Birder | 1 | | - | - | 1 (0.4%) | 1 (0.2%) | | | |
| Canoe/Kayak | 3 | 1 | - | - | 3 (1.2%) | 4 (1.0%) | | | |
| Driver | 14 | _ | - | - | 10 (3.9%) | 14 (3.5%) | | | |
| Helicopter | 5 | 1 | - | - | 3 (1.2%) | 6 (1.5%) | | | |
| Hiker | 2 | - | - | - | 2 (0.8%) | 2 (0.5%) | | | |
| Horseback rider | - | 2 | - | - | 0 | 2 (0.5%) | | | |
| OHV | 2 | - | - | - | 2 (0.8%) | 2 (0.5%) | | | |
| Photographer | - | - | - | 1 | 1 (0.4%) | 1 (0.2%) | | | |
| Rafter | - | 2 | - | - | 2 (0.8%) | 2 (0.5%) | | | |
| Researcher | ~ | 2 | - | - | 1 (0.4%) | 2 (0.5%) | | | |
| RR vehicle | 35 | 73 | 1 | 4 | 75 (29.2%) | 113 (28.0%) | | | |
| Small plane | 46 | 44 | 1 | 6 | 46 (17.9%) | 97 (24.1%) | | | |
| Tourist train | 50 | 96 | 1 | 2 | 108 (42.0%) | 149 (37.0%) | | | |
| Total | 165 | 222 | 3 | 13 | 257 (100%) | 403 (100%) | | | |

APPENDIX L: TOWER BREEDING AREA SUMMARIES

¹Eagle behavior, N=none, W=watched, F=flushed, U=unknown. ²D-D total=Observations on dawn-to-dusk days.

•

| Table 40. Observed foraging events and success, Tower BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|------------------|-------|-----|---------|-----|-------|------|--|--|
| | Fish | | Birds | | Unknown | | Total | | | |
| Sex | E | S-U ² | E | S-U | E | S-U | E | S-U | | |
| Male | 4 | 2-2 | 1 | 0-1 | 1 | 1-0 | 6 | 3-3 | | |
| Female | 11 | 8-3 | 0 | 0-0 | 0 | 0-0 | 11 | 8-3 | | |
| Unknown | 1 | 0-1 | 0 | 0-0 | 0 | 0-0 | 1 | 0-1 | | |
| Total | 16 | 8-3 | 1 | 0-1 | 1 | 1-0 | 18 | 11-7 | | |

 ${}^{1}E = A$ single foraging event for a food item, not the amount of strikes to capture an item. ${}^{2}S-U = Successful - unsuccessful captures of prey.$

| Table 41. Observed prey types delivered to the nest, Tower BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|----------|----------|------------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Sex | Fish | Bird | Mammal | Unknown | Total | | | | | |
| Male | 29 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 40 (58.0%) | | | | | |
| Female | 22 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 29 (42.0%) | | | | | |
| Total | 51 (73.9%) | 6 (8.7%) | 2 (2.9%) | 10 (14.5%) | 69 (100%) | | | | | |

| Table 42. Observed prey items delivered to the nest, Tower BA, AZ, 1998. | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|---|----|----|----|----|-----|-------|--|
| Sex | S ¹ | С | UF | AC | UB | UM | Unk | Total | |
| Male | 6 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 40 | |
| Female | 4 | 2 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 29 | |
| Total | 10 | 2 | 39 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 69 | |

¹Prey items, S=suckers, C=carp, UF=unknown fish, AC=Amercian coot, UB=unknown bird, UM=unknown mammal, Unk=unknown.