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# Abstract

# Introduction

Paragraph 1: Importance of biodiversity monitoring in large scale landscapes for evidence-based management.

Mapping biodiversity hotspots, defined as the area with high diversity in species (cite), is crucial for pinpointing bird-preferred habitats and guiding conservation priorities (Stattersfield et al., 1998; Garcia, 2006). This process involves overlaying species distribution maps to identify spatial locations with the highest richness (cite).

Paragraph 2: Current limitation and challenges

However, hotspot mapping requires species distribution maps for all species in the study area, and previous studies have often relied on coarse-resolution distribution maps, such as 5 km grids (Jenkins et al., 2010) or 1.2 km resolution from BirdLife (Merker & Chandler, 2020). While these coarse-resolution hotspots are valuable for large-scale conservation planning, they are less informative for localized management efforts, such as within national or regional parks, where finer resolution is essential.

Paragraph 3: ARU data can provide large spatialtemporal scale of survey

Paragraph 4: LiDAR could provide detailed horizontal structure data

Paragraph 5: Objectives are: 1) identify the avian diversity value with the asymptotic richness ARU data, and 2) identify key environmental covariates that support high asymptotic richness, and 3) recreate the avian diversity map using the LiDAR layer across the whole region of JPRF.

# Methods

## Study area and acoustic recording sites

The study was conducted in the John Prince Research Forest (~150 km2 in area), located in central British Columbia, Canada, within the dry sub-boreal spruce biogeoclimatic zone (Fig.1A). Audio data were collected from 2020 to 2022 during the breeding season (May to July) between 4am and 7am, using 66 Audio Moths (cite). Recordings were made for 1 minute every 5 minutes. Each ARU was placed at least two kilometers apart to minimize spatial correlation. Variability in the number of active ARUs at each site/date occurred due to setup logistics and field challenges such as battery depletion, firmware issues, or disturbances by wildlife (Fig.1B). We dropped data from sites which have less than 15 days of ARU days to avoid potential bias due to low surveying effort. This resulted in each site having an average of 106 ARU days, ranging from 32 to 182 days.



Fig. 1. Spatiotemporal distribution of surveying effort. Number of active ARUs during the surveying seasons across the study sites and across the surveying period.

## Acoustic data processing and target species

Collected acoustic data were analyzed using the BirdNET Analyzer v2.4 model (cite with GitHub repository), utilizing the parameters listed in Table 1. The entire dataset, comprising 1.5 terabytes of audio, required approximately 72 consecutive hours of processing. The overall species list was generated in four steps: (1) BirdNET detections were initially filtered using a confidence threshold of 0.8. For each detected category, five recording segments with the highest confidence scores were manually reviewed. Categories with at least one confirmed vocalization were retained, resulting in 136 categories. (2) Non-bird categories, such as Car Engine, Red Squirrel, Wood Frog, and Slender Meadow Katydid, were removed, reducing the list to 129 categories. (3) Species not listed in the British Columbia Breeding Bird Atlas (<https://www.birdatlas.bc.ca/>), which documents species recorded in the Prince George area since 2008, were excluded, leaving 123 species. (4) Species detected at fewer than two sites or on fewer than two days in June (main breeding season) were excluded, resulting in a final list of 122 species (Supplementary Table A). The overall species list included a diverse range of taxa such as raptors, waterfowl, warblers, sparrows, flycatchers, woodpeckers, owls, and other families.

Target species were selected from the overall species list if they are “breeding, dawn chorus, passerines”. We defined such criteria to avoid biased detection given our recording schedule were set during breeding season dawn chorus. For each species, we defined species-specific BirdNET thresholds to retain reliable BirdNET detections following the methods recommended by Tseng et al. (2025). Stratified sampling was used to select 360 recording segments per species, with 20 segments sampled from each 0.5 confidence interval class (ranging from 0.1 to 1.0). Each segment was manually reviewed via listening or spectrogram analysis to classify detections as true or false positives. A threshold achieving a precision of 0.95, indicating that 95% of remaining detections were true positives, was then identified for each species (see Tseng et al. 2025 for detailed workflow of species-specific thresholds). Some species (e.g., Bohemian Waxwing, Brown Creeper, Mountain Chickadee, and White-crowned Sparrow) were not able to achieve a precision of 95% even with highest possible threshold. Thus, they were dropped from the list. Our target species list ended up including 40 passerines (Table 2).

Table 1. BirdNET algorithms arguments, with default value and the values used in this study. The empty cell in the used value column indicates customized directory.

| Argument | Default value | Used value |
| --- | --- | --- |
| i | none | -- |
| o | none | -- |
| lat | -1 | same as default |
| lon | -1 | same as default |
| week | -1 | same as default |
| slist | none | same as default |
| sensitivity | 1.0 | same as default |
| min\_conf | 0.1 | same as default |
| overlap | 0 | same as default |
| rtype | table | r |
| threads | 1 | 4 |
| batchsize | 1 | 4 |
| locale | en | same as default |
| sf\_thresh | 0.03 | same as default |
| classifier | none | same as default |
| fmin | 0 | same as default |
| fmax | 15000 | same as default |
| output\_file | none | -- |
| skip\_existing\_results | FALSE | TRUE |

Table 2. The 40 breeding, dawn chorus, passerines selected as our target species. For each species, the table includes the total number of detections by BirdNET and the number of sites where the species was detected. The values were calculated after applying the species-specific thresholds (that achieve 95% precision) and dropped sites that don’t have more than 15 ARU days.

| Common name | Scientific name | Threshold (95%) | No. detections | No. sites |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Swainson's Thrush | *Catharus ustulatus* | 0.10 | 327234 | 59 |
| Hammond's Flycatcher | *Empidonax hammondii* | 0.10 | 140580 | 59 |
| Yellow-rumped Warbler | *Setophaga coronata* | 0.10 | 110942 | 59 |
| Warbling Vireo | *Vireo gilvus* | 0.10 | 86199 | 59 |
| Golden-crowned Kinglet | *Regulus satrapa* | 0.10 | 84229 | 59 |
| Magnolia Warbler | *Setophaga magnolia* | 0.10 | 74066 | 59 |
| Dark-eyed Junco | *Junco hyemalis* | 0.10 | 48329 | 59 |
| Western Tanager | *Piranga ludoviciana* | 0.10 | 39421 | 59 |
| American Robin | *Turdus migratorius* | 0.10 | 37644 | 59 |
| MacGillivray's Warbler | *Geothlypis tolmiei* | 0.10 | 30276 | 59 |
| Orange-crowned Warbler | *Leiothlypis celata* | 0.10 | 11907 | 59 |
| Pine Siskin | *Spinus pinus* | 0.10 | 6399 | 59 |
| Northern Waterthrush | *Parkesia noveboracensis* | 0.10 | 145743 | 58 |
| American Redstart | *Setophaga ruticilla* | 0.10 | 74866 | 58 |
| White-throated Sparrow | *Zonotrichia albicollis* | 0.10 | 42408 | 58 |
| Pacific Wren | *Troglodytes pacificus* | 0.10 | 60245 | 57 |
| Red-breasted Nuthatch | *Sitta canadensis* | 0.21 | 15373 | 57 |
| Tennessee Warbler | *Leiothlypis peregrina* | 0.10 | 36095 | 56 |
| Ruby-crowned Kinglet | *Corthylio calendula* | 0.10 | 13718 | 56 |
| Least Flycatcher | *Empidonax minimus* | 0.16 | 36919 | 55 |
| Chipping Sparrow | *Spizella passerina* | 0.10 | 5162 | 54 |
| Cedar Waxwing | *Bombycilla cedrorum* | 0.36 | 1994 | 53 |
| Olive-sided Flycatcher | *Contopus cooperi* | 0.31 | 9201 | 52 |
| Common Raven | *Corvus corax* | 0.10 | 4668 | 52 |
| Varied Thrush | *Ixoreus naevius* | 0.61 | 6693 | 51 |
| Townsend's Warbler | *Setophaga townsendi* | 0.24 | 3039 | 51 |
| Boreal Chickadee | *Poecile hudsonicus* | 0.20 | 2918 | 51 |
| Western Wood-Pewee | *Contopus sordidulus* | 0.10 | 10992 | 50 |
| Dusky Flycatcher | *Empidonax oberholseri* | 0.26 | 3495 | 49 |
| Alder Flycatcher | *Empidonax alnorum* | 0.10 | 21031 | 48 |
| Common Yellowthroat | *Geothlypis trichas* | 0.10 | 4153 | 46 |
| Western Flycatcher | *Empidonax difficilis* | 0.41 | 1306 | 37 |
| Hermit Thrush | *Catharus guttatus* | 0.79 | 3301 | 36 |
| Wilson's Warbler | *Cardellina pusilla* | 0.46 | 603 | 35 |
| Black-capped Chickadee | *Poecile atricapillus* | 0.26 | 606 | 32 |
| American Crow | *Corvus brachyrhynchos* | 0.10 | 1477 | 30 |
| Song Sparrow | *Melospiza melodia* | 0.10 | 3390 | 23 |
| Red-winged Blackbird | *Agelaius phoeniceus* | 0.10 | 204 | 23 |
| Yellow Warbler | *Setophaga petechia* | 0.40 | 394 | 21 |
| Blackpoll Warbler | *Setophaga striata* | 0.85 | 51 | 10 |

## Asymptotic richness detected by ARU

Based on a dataset with 40 species and 59 sites, we calculated the number of ARU days that each of the species were detected and the total ARU days (Fig. 2). Simply comparing the observed richness of each site (i.e., sum of the coloured cells for each column in Fig. 2) would not be a fair comparison as each sites has different observer effort (i.e., ARU days). Thus, we chose asymptotic richness to represent the diversity of sites (Chao 2014), to standardize the different in surveying effort between sites.

To calculate the asymptotic richness, we used iNEXT (iNterpolation and EXTrapolation) R package (cite), which focuses on calculating the Hill numbers to reflect diversity. Specifically, we the iNEXT::*iNEXT()* function, with incidence data, to compute asymptotic richness estimates and the associated bootstrap standard error.
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Fig. 2. Number of days that each species was detected in each site by ARU. Species in the lower part of the graph represents generalists, such as American Robin, Dark-eyed Junco, and Golden-crowned Kinglet, that were detected in most of the sites. While species on the top part, such as Yellow Warbler and Red-winged blackbird, only get detected in part of the sites, potentially showing preference of habitat.

## LiDAR habitat covariates and model selection

The Lidar data was collected with a point density of XYZ during 2015 leave off season. We used an area-based approach to rasterize the point clouds, with a spatial resolution of 10 meters. During the modelling stage, we aggregated the covariates within a 100-meter radius circle, to reflect the habitat that a bird is using when getting detected in an ARU site. A total of 17 LiDAR covariates were used as candidate covariates (Table 3). We classified the LidDAR covariates based on the categories outlined in Bakx et al., 2018, which indicated that Canopy and Total Vegetation LiDAR covariate are most commonly related to bird species richness prediction (Fig. 4 in Bakx et al., 2018).

Table 3. LiDAR covariates used in the study. Add the range of each covariates that observed across the sites.

| Type | Name | Definition |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Topography/  Ground | dem | Average elevation |
| slope | Average slope |
| aspect | Average aspect |
| wet | Proportion of polygon covered by wetlands VRI |
| dist\_wet\_lidar | Shortest distance to the wetland edge |
| d\_vri\_polyedge | Distance to VRI polygon stand edge |
| Canopy | cc1\_3 | Average crown closure between 1 – 3 m |
| cc3\_10 | Average crown closure between 3 – 10 m |
| cc10 | Average crown closure above 10m |
| chm | Average canopy height |
| vdi | Vertical distribution if intercepted canopy elements ranging from 0 and 1 using max height |
| vdi\_95 | Vertical distribution if intercepted canopy elements ranging from 0 and 1 using 95% height |
| Total vegetation | less\_10 | Proportion of polygon with forest age less than 10 years |
| age\_30 | Proportion of polygon with forest age less than 30 years |
| age\_mid | Proportion of polygon with forest age between 31 – 79 years |
| age\_80 | Proportion of polygon with forest age greater than 80 years |
| prop\_decid | Proportion of deciduous tree counts for all trees having DBH > 10cm |
| decid\_dens | Number of deciduous trees per unit area |
| conf\_dens | Number of conifer trees per unit area |
| tree\_dens | Number of total trees per unit area |
| ba\_dens | Sum of basal area of all trees per unit area |
| site\_class | Whether the site is conifer or deciduous tree dominant |

We used an information-theoretical approach for model selection and inference. Instead of interpreting a single best-fit model, we fitted models using all possible linear combinations of the 23 LiDAR covariates. We then performed model averaging to access variable importance and derive averaged coefficients for prediction. This analysis was done by using the R package MuMIn (cite), specifically the dredge() package, with the linear model as our full model.

## Model prediction

After defining the top LiDAR covariates that is most relevant to the breeding bird diversity, we then derive the raster files of these LiDAR covariates with the original resolution (10m). Then we used the averaged parameters to extrapolate the asymptotic richness across the whole study area, the John Prince Research Forest region. This can provide us with an information for the biodiversity of the area.

# Result

## Asymptotic richness estimates to balance surveying effort

The estimated asymptotic richness for each site ranged from 19.49 to 48.79 (Table 4). The mean estimated asymptotic richness is 36.84 ± 4.48 (SD). We grouped the sites into small surveying effort (ARU days < 90 days), medium surveying effort (ARU days between 90 to 120 days), and high surveying effort (ARU days > 120 days). The mean difference between estimated asymptotic richness and observed richness is 3.0, 4.6 and 2.8 species for low, medium and high surveying effort, respectively (Table 4). Most of the species accumulation curve showed that, regardless of the surveying effort (ARU days), the accumulated number of species reached plateau at the given surveying effort (Fig. 3).

Table 4. The estimated asymptotic richness for each of the sites. ARU days is the days that the ARU is functioning in that particular site. And the species ARU days is the accumulated days that a single species is observed, summing across multiple species. The estimated asymptotic richness and the bootstrap standard error were estimated by iNEXT::iNEXT() function in R, using extrapolate method.

| Site | ARU days | Species ARU days | Observed richness | Asymptotic richness | No. of species added | LCL | UCL |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N\_15 | 32 | 510 | 34 | 34.24 | + 0.24 | 34.01 | 38.62 |
| N\_25 | 50 | 463 | 31 | 35.41 | + 4.41 | 31.48 | 71.14 |
| N\_11 | 50 | 831 | 34 | 34.16 | + 0.16 | 34.01 | 37.49 |
| 14\_29 | 52 | 606 | 31 | 34.92 | + 3.92 | 31.55 | 59.22 |
| 14\_05 | 59 | 628 | 33 | 38.90 | + 5.9 | 34.05 | 66.10 |
| N\_19 | 65 | 641 | 31 | 48.72 | + 17.72 | 33.49 | 157.04 |
| 14\_02 | 66 | 115 | 19 | 19.49 | + 0.49 | 19.03 | 27.34 |
| N\_23 | 69 | 571 | 31 | 33.22 | + 2.22 | 31.26 | 49.80 |
| 14\_17 | 70 | 753 | 34 | 39.91 | + 5.91 | 35.05 | 67.18 |
| 14\_42 | 71 | 775 | 29 | 29.66 | + 0.66 | 29.06 | 36.72 |
| 14\_23 | 76 | 863 | 37 | 37.99 | + 0.99 | 37.09 | 47.94 |
| 14\_16 | 81 | 1100 | 34 | 34.00 | + 0 | 34.00 | 35.61 |
| N\_05 | 82 | 862 | 31 | 31.16 | + 0.16 | 31.01 | 34.50 |
| 14\_03 | 82 | 990 | 37 | 37.40 | + 0.4 | 37.03 | 42.26 |
| N\_08 | 83 | 453 | 32 | 36.45 | + 4.45 | 32.49 | 72.45 |
| N\_10 | 83 | 1034 | 35 | 41.17 | + 6.17 | 35.96 | 74.68 |
| 14\_35 | 85 | 570 | 31 | 31.10 | + 0.1 | 31.00 | 33.52 |
| 14\_41 | 85 | 959 | 32 | 34.63 | + 2.63 | 32.37 | 50.67 |
| N\_22 | 87 | 926 | 35 | 36.48 | + 1.48 | 35.17 | 47.76 |
| 14\_08 | 89 | 746 | 34 | 35.98 | + 1.98 | 34.27 | 48.23 |
| 14\_30 | 91 | 453 | 31 | 43.12 | + 12.12 | 33.18 | 98.45 |
| 14\_34 | 91 | 1134 | 34 | 34.49 | + 0.49 | 34.04 | 40.19 |
| 14\_21 | 92 | 870 | 36 | 37.48 | + 1.48 | 36.17 | 48.77 |
| N\_16 | 94 | 1012 | 33 | 37.45 | + 4.45 | 33.49 | 73.51 |
| 14\_15 | 98 | 641 | 31 | 35.12 | + 4.12 | 31.67 | 56.54 |
| 14\_19 | 101 | 1145 | 38 | 38.89 | + 0.89 | 38.10 | 46.30 |
| 14\_04 | 102 | 492 | 28 | 48.79 | + 20.79 | 33.02 | 114.06 |
| 14\_18 | 102 | 807 | 30 | 33.96 | + 3.96 | 30.55 | 58.46 |
| 14\_10 | 103 | 865 | 29 | 33.46 | + 4.46 | 29.49 | 69.54 |
| 14\_11 | 104 | 1077 | 34 | 42.91 | + 8.91 | 35.51 | 86.79 |
| 14\_31 | 105 | 1247 | 35 | 35.66 | + 0.66 | 35.06 | 42.75 |
| N\_14 | 105 | 1515 | 35 | 35.99 | + 0.99 | 35.07 | 49.30 |
| N\_21 | 108 | 1068 | 33 | 35.23 | + 2.23 | 33.26 | 51.88 |
| 14\_20 | 109 | 1015 | 35 | 38.96 | + 3.96 | 35.55 | 63.48 |
| 14\_24 | 109 | 1166 | 37 | 41.13 | + 4.13 | 37.67 | 62.56 |
| N\_18 | 111 | 533 | 29 | 31.64 | + 2.64 | 29.37 | 47.72 |
| N\_09 | 111 | 1421 | 36 | 41.95 | + 5.95 | 36.92 | 74.61 |
| 14\_28 | 114 | 985 | 34 | 37.10 | + 3.1 | 34.50 | 53.15 |
| 14\_06 | 115 | 748 | 27 | 31.46 | + 4.46 | 27.49 | 67.58 |
| N\_04 | 115 | 1654 | 35 | 36.98 | + 1.98 | 35.18 | 56.95 |
| N\_12 | 118 | 1645 | 35 | 39.46 | + 4.46 | 35.49 | 75.59 |
| 14\_01 | 121 | 915 | 31 | 38.93 | + 7.93 | 31.98 | 95.30 |
| N\_06 | 121 | 1665 | 36 | 45.92 | + 9.92 | 37.85 | 89.05 |
| 14\_33 | 124 | 1115 | 34 | 34.99 | + 0.99 | 34.09 | 44.99 |
| N\_24 | 137 | 1642 | 37 | 37.25 | + 0.25 | 37.01 | 41.71 |
| N\_13 | 139 | 834 | 35 | 36.49 | + 1.49 | 35.17 | 47.81 |
| 14\_07 | 139 | 1404 | 36 | 36.12 | + 0.12 | 36.01 | 38.91 |
| N\_17 | 139 | 1597 | 34 | 34.50 | + 0.5 | 34.03 | 42.39 |
| 14\_37 | 143 | 1300 | 36 | 37.49 | + 1.49 | 36.17 | 48.81 |
| 14\_40 | 143 | 1455 | 35 | 35.08 | + 0.08 | 35.00 | 37.26 |
| 14\_39 | 145 | 888 | 32 | 38.21 | + 6.21 | 32.97 | 71.87 |
| 14\_38 | 147 | 1393 | 35 | 36.49 | + 1.49 | 35.17 | 47.81 |
| N\_07 | 155 | 1180 | 33 | 34.49 | + 1.49 | 33.17 | 45.82 |
| 14\_25 | 155 | 1841 | 37 | 37.99 | + 0.99 | 37.07 | 51.35 |
| N\_01 | 155 | 1893 | 35 | 35.50 | + 0.5 | 35.03 | 43.40 |
| 14\_09 | 164 | 1990 | 37 | 37.99 | + 0.99 | 37.09 | 48.01 |
| 14\_14 | 167 | 1668 | 33 | 37.47 | + 4.47 | 33.49 | 73.68 |
| 14\_13 | 169 | 1877 | 35 | 42.95 | + 7.95 | 35.98 | 99.45 |
| 14\_26 | 182 | 1934 | 36 | 39.98 | + 3.98 | 36.55 | 64.58 |
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Fig. 3. The rarefaction curves for sites with ARU days (A) fewer than 90 days, (B) between 90 to 120 days, and (C) more than 120 days.

## Distance to disturbed edge has highest predictive power for richness

Among all 17 LiDAR covariates, the covariate with highest sum of model weights is the VRI polygon stand edge (d\_vri\_polyedge), with the sum of weights of 0.97 (Fig. 4). It is also the only variable being significant (alpha = 0.05) in the average model, with a coefficient of -0.039 and a p-value of 0.01. The predicted intercept in the average model is XYZ. All other variables, such as average aspect of the site (aspect) and the average crown closure between 1 – 3m (cc1\_3), had lower sum of model weights than 0.8 and were not significant (alpha = 0.05) in the averaged model (Fig. 4).
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Fig. 4. The sum of model weights for the 17 LiDAR covariates, representing the importance of the covariates.

## Map of songbird diversity

Currently requesting the LiDAR maps from JPRF

# Discussion

* Assumption of independent of each site
* Restriction of the species: expanded the analysis of multi species, but lost the information of other species given that BirdNET have species-specific performance and we must filter out species due to the performance, miss the broader view of the community
* Statistics: we didn’t find a way to incorporate the uncertainty of the estimated asymptotic richness. As the provided LCL and UCL are not uniformed distributed, thus it’s hard to use bootstrap to translate that uncertainty into the modelling process. Baysian modelling might be good?
* General guideline for future ARU community research: Only use rarefaction curve to calculate richness to represent diversity given the restriction of the acoustic detection data (ARU + BirdNET). Only every three seconds and have potential false negatives. Another way of using the data could be occupancy (group presence or absence into 1 day), detection rate (count). Need some general guidance of the methods to better use the acoustic detection data,

# Conclusion

# Literature cited

# Supplementary

Table A. The full list of 122 species detected by ARUs at the study site. For each species, the table includes the total number of detections by BirdNET and the number of sites where the species was detected. The values were calculated before applying species-specific threshold, and before dropping any unused sites in the analysis. The species represent a diverse range of taxa, including raptors, waterfowl, warblers, sparrows, flycatchers, woodpeckers, owls, and other families.

| **Family** | **Scientific name** | **Common name** | **No. detections** | **No. sites** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Accipitridae  (Hawks, Eagles, and Kites) | *Astur atricapillus* | American Goshawk | 4713 | 54 |
| *Buteo jamaicensis* | Red-tailed Hawk | 296 | 50 |
| *Buteo platypterus* | Broad-winged Hawk | 3302 | 57 |
| *Haliaeetus leucocephalus* | Bald Eagle | 398 | 30 |
| *Accipiter striatus* | Sharp-shinned Hawk | 116 | 38 |
| Pandionidae  (Osprey) | *Pandion haliaetus* | Osprey | 238 | 39 |
| Anatida  (Ducks, Geese, and Waterfowl) | *Anas platyrhynchos* | Mallard | 478 | 40 |
| *Branta canadensis* | Canada Goose | 788 | 39 |
| *Mergus merganser* | Common Merganser | 866 | 32 |
| *Bucephala clangula* | Common Goldeneye | 82 | 21 |
| *Anas crecca* | Green-winged Teal | 124 | 25 |
| *Lophodytes cucullatus* | Hooded Merganser | 75 | 13 |
| *Bucephala islandica* | Barrow's Goldeneye | 19 | 7 |
| *Cygnus buccinator* | Trumpeter Swan | 97 | 18 |
| *Spatula discors* | Blue-winged Teal | 24 | 7 |
| *Mareca americana* | American Wigeon | 23 | 4 |
| *Aythya collaris* | Ring-necked Duck | 144 | 14 |
| Trochilidae  (Hummingbirds) | *Selasphorus rufus* | Rufous Hummingbird | 177 | 24 |
| Caprimulgidae (Nightjars and Allies) | *Chordeiles minor* | Common Nighthawk | 469 | 45 |
| Laridae  (Gulls, Terns, and Skimmers) | *Chroicocephalus philadelphia* | Bonaparte's Gull | 31 | 6 |
| Scolopacidae  (Sandpipers and Allies) | *Actitis macularius* | Spotted Sandpiper | 297 | 33 |
| *Gallinago delicata* | Wilson's Snipe | 11401 | 37 |
| *Tringa solitaria* | Solitary Sandpiper | 94 | 23 |
| *Tringa melanoleuca* | Greater Yellowlegs | 994 | 48 |
| Alcedinidae  (Kingfishers) | *Megaceryle alcyon* | Belted Kingfisher | 462 | 51 |
| Falconidae  (Falcons and Caracaras) | *Falco sparverius* | American Kestrel | 143 | 42 |
| *Falco columbarius* | Merlin | 528 | 32 |
| Phasianidae  (Pheasants, Grouse, and Allies) | *Canachites canadensis* | Spruce Grouse | 15906 | 58 |
| *Bonasa umbellus* | Ruffed Grouse | 1000 | 49 |
| *Lagopus lagopus* | Willow Ptarmigan | 62 | 23 |
| Gaviidae  (Loons) | *Gavia immer* | Common Loon | 5530 | 57 |
| Gruidae  (Cranes) | *Antigone canadensis* | Sandhill Crane | 535 | 35 |
| Rallidae  (Rails, Gallinules, and Coots) | *Porzana carolina* | Sora | 3448 | 17 |
| Bombycillidae  (Waxwings) | *Bombycilla cedrorum* | Cedar Waxwing | 5771 | 59 |
| *Bombycilla garrulus* | Bohemian Waxwing | 151 | 40 |
| Cardinalidae  (Cardinals and Allies) | *Piranga ludoviciana* | Western Tanager | 39616 | 61 |
| *Pheucticus ludovicianus* | Rose-breasted Grosbeak | 3278 | 59 |
| Certhiidae  (Treecreepers) | *Certhia americana* | Brown Creeper | 15142 | 61 |
| Cinclidae  (Dippers) | *Cinclus mexicanus* | American Dipper | 1364 | 27 |
| Corvidae  (Crows, Jays, and Magpies) | *Perisoreus canadensis* | Canada Jay | 634 | 55 |
| *Corvus corax* | Common Raven | 4672 | 54 |
| *Corvus brachyrhynchos* | American Crow | 1477 | 30 |
| Fringillidae  (Finches, Euphonias, and Allies) | *Pinicola enucleator* | Pine Grosbeak | 1139 | 61 |
| *Spinus pinus* | Pine Siskin | 6400 | 60 |
| *Loxia leucoptera* | White-winged Crossbill | 6125 | 60 |
| *Coccothraustes vespertinus* | Evening Grosbeak | 552 | 58 |
| *Haemorhous purpureus* | Purple Finch | 10420 | 62 |
| *Leucosticte tephrocotis* | Gray-crowned Rosy-Finch | 1210 | 51 |
| *Haemorhous mexicanus* | House Finch | 4431 | 59 |
| *Loxia curvirostra* | Red Crossbill | 165 | 45 |
| Hirundinidae  (Swallows) | *Tachycineta thalassina* | Violet-green Swallow | 485 | 39 |
| *Tachycineta bicolor* | Tree Swallow | 1094 | 27 |
| Icteridae  (Troupials and Allies) | *Agelaius phoeniceus* | Red-winged Blackbird | 204 | 23 |
| *Molothrus ater* | Brown-headed Cowbird | 87 | 28 |
| *Euphagus carolinus* | Rusty Blackbird | 1395 | 36 |
| Motacillidae  (Wagtails and Pipits) | *Anthus rubescens* | American Pipit | 4368 | 58 |
| Paridae  (Tits, Chickadees, and Titmice) | *Poecile hudsonicus* | Boreal Chickadee | 4430 | 57 |
| *Poecile gambeli* | Mountain Chickadee | 12994 | 61 |
| *Poecile atricapillus* | Black-capped Chickadee | 1615 | 54 |
| Parulidae  (New World Warblers) | *Setophaga magnolia* | Magnolia Warbler | 74084 | 62 |
| *Setophaga coronata* | Yellow-rumped Warbler | 111092 | 62 |
| *Setophaga townsendi* | Townsend's Warbler | 7361 | 61 |
| *Setophaga striata* | Blackpoll Warbler | 4619 | 61 |
| *Geothlypis tolmiei* | MacGillivray's Warbler | 30304 | 61 |
| *Leiothlypis peregrina* | Tennessee Warbler | 36766 | 58 |
| *Setophaga ruticilla* | American Redstart | 74872 | 59 |
| *Seiurus aurocapilla* | Ovenbird | 5286 | 59 |
| *Cardellina pusilla* | Wilson's Warbler | 4738 | 60 |
| *Leiothlypis celata* | Orange-crowned Warbler | 11951 | 60 |
| *Parkesia noveboracensis* | Northern Waterthrush | 146613 | 60 |
| *Setophaga petechia* | Yellow Warbler | 3407 | 42 |
| *Geothlypis trichas* | Common Yellowthroat | 4153 | 46 |
| Passerellidae  (New World Sparrows) | *Spizella passerina* | Chipping Sparrow | 5162 | 54 |
| *Zonotrichia albicollis* | White-throated Sparrow | 42421 | 60 |
| *Zonotrichia leucophrys* | White-crowned Sparrow | 69534 | 62 |
| *Junco hyemalis* | Dark-eyed Junco | 48344 | 62 |
| *Passerella iliaca* | Fox Sparrow | 2861 | 60 |
| *Melospiza lincolnii* | Lincoln's Sparrow | 19790 | 59 |
| *Melospiza melodia* | Song Sparrow | 3390 | 23 |
| *Spizella pallida* | Clay-colored Sparrow | 228 | 39 |
| *Melospiza georgiana* | Swamp Sparrow | 1846 | 56 |
| *Zonotrichia atricapilla* | Golden-crowned Sparrow | 140 | 35 |
| *Pooecetes gramineus* | Vesper Sparrow | 456 | 32 |
| Regulidae  (Kinglets) | *Regulus satrapa* | Golden-crowned Kinglet | 84683 | 61 |
| *Corthylio calendula* | Ruby-crowned Kinglet | 13918 | 59 |
| Sittidae  (Nuthatches) | *Sitta canadensis* | Red-breasted Nuthatch | 23207 | 61 |
| Troglodytidae  (Wrens) | *Troglodytes pacificus* | Pacific Wren | 60989 | 59 |
| Turdidae  (Thrushes and Allies) | *Catharus ustulatus* | Swainson's Thrush | 327431 | 62 |
| *Ixoreus naevius* | Varied Thrush | 32529 | 61 |
| *Catharus guttatus* | Hermit Thrush | 52026 | 61 |
| *Turdus migratorius* | American Robin | 37737 | 62 |
| *Myadestes townsendi* | Townsend's Solitaire | 787 | 55 |
| *Sialia currucoides* | Mountain Bluebird | 1238 | 54 |
| Tyrannidae  (Tyrant Flycatchers) | *Empidonax difficilis* | Western Flycatcher | 12474 | 62 |
| *Empidonax hammondii* | Hammond's Flycatcher | 141949 | 62 |
| *Empidonax minimus* | Least Flycatcher | 44654 | 58 |
| *Empidonax oberholseri* | Dusky Flycatcher | 9356 | 58 |
| *Contopus cooperi* | Olive-sided Flycatcher | 17061 | 61 |
| *Empidonax flaviventris* | Yellow-bellied Flycatcher | 5815 | 61 |
| *Empidonax alnorum* | Alder Flycatcher | 21412 | 49 |
| *Tyrannus tyrannus* | Eastern Kingbird | 48 | 26 |
| *Contopus sordidulus* | Western Wood-Pewee | 10992 | 50 |
| Vireonidae  (Vireos, Shrike-Babblers, and Erpornis) | *Vireo gilvus* | Warbling Vireo | 87002 | 62 |
| *Vireo cassinii* | Cassin's Vireo | 6188 | 55 |
| *Vireo olivaceus* | Red-eyed Vireo | 600 | 35 |
| Ardeidae  (Herons, Egrets, and Bitterns) | *Botaurus lentiginosus* | American Bittern | 359 | 34 |
| Picidae  (Woodpeckers) | *Sphyrapicus varius* | Yellow-bellied Sapsucker | 5261 | 57 |
| *Sphyrapicus nuchalis* | Red-naped Sapsucker | 5182 | 57 |
| *Picoides arcticus* | Black-backed Woodpecker | 2928 | 60 |
| *Picoides dorsalis* | American Three-toed Woodpecker | 6417 | 62 |
| *Dryobates villosus* | Hairy Woodpecker | 1589 | 54 |
| *Dryocopus pileatus* | Pileated Woodpecker | 1910 | 56 |
| *Dryobates pubescens* | Downy Woodpecker | 331 | 49 |
| *Colaptes auratus* | Northern Flicker | 950 | 43 |
| Podicipedidae  (Grebes) | *Podiceps grisegena* | Red-necked Grebe | 26 | 8 |
| Strigidae  (Owls) | *Strix varia* | Barred Owl | 498 | 43 |
| *Bubo virginianus* | Great Horned Owl | 4902 | 57 |
| *Asio otus* | Long-eared Owl | 294 | 40 |
| *Strix nebulosa* | Great Gray Owl | 419 | 36 |
| *Aegolius acadicus* | Northern Saw-whet Owl | 2223 | 54 |
| *Glaucidium gnoma* | Northern Pygmy-Owl | 876 | 48 |
| *Aegolius funereus* | Boreal Owl | 5826 | 44 |