

Project Outline: Wildlife Working Team

Team Roundtable Wildlife Team	Mission Prioritize an abridged list of species to monitor for the CFLRP Monitoring Plan, predict population trends for each target species if forest restoration is achieved, and recommend data collection and monitoring methods for each target species given funding constraints and monitoring methods available.	Deliverables A final report building from existing CFLR monitoring plan and including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overview of field protocols, sampling approaches, and potential analytical approaches 2. Options: balancing rigorous monitoring of 1° species and casual monitoring of 2° species 3. Wildlife Team's recommendations: based on funding, rigor, public interest
Timeline Team Launched Nov. 13, 2012; will complete work by February of 2014.	Goals <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify primary and secondary species for monitoring that meet CFLRP and FS needs 2. Develop hypothesized species response (≈ population trends) for each 1° and 2° species 3. Explicitly integrate spatial and temporal scales in species selection and sampling approach 4. Establish range of monitoring options that encompass cost and rigor spectrums as needed 5. Identify field sampling protocols for selected species 6. Describe potential analytical methods 7. Identify opportunities for collaborating entities to contribute to monitoring implementation 	

Scope <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus: past efforts have focused on vegetation structure and assumptions that if we do good things for structure, the wildlife will benefit. This effort will focus on the need for wildlife monitoring, informed by but not dependent upon desired conditions for vegetation 2. Species: Open to including any species; will consult list of species from 2011 CFLR Monitoring Plan but we will not be limited by the past plan 3. Scale: Will include both landscape scale and site scale considerations in recommending monitoring methods and estimating expected outcomes; we will need to define “landscape” as well, possibly by species (will refer to language developed by other related efforts to define restoration and desired conditions) – Rick to edit 4. Methods: Will consider the best, most effective, and efficient monitoring methods; will not be constrained by the USFS's Common Stand Exam or currently available funding. We will only recommend monitoring species with existing established or emerging monitoring protocols—we will not invent new protocols. If preliminary protocols don't already exist for a species, that species will not be included in the monitoring recommendations. 5. Places: Recommended wildlife sampling will be within the CFLRP project area (both on and off treatment sites) and will not be constrained by Common Stand Exam (CSE) monitoring plots.

Why this / why now? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As the Landscape Restoration team discussed and developed monitoring approaches in support of the CFLRP, concerns were raised that vegetation data collected through Common Stand Exams was inadequate to monitor wildlife response to CFLRP treatments. As a result, the Wildlife Working Team was convened to develop wildlife monitoring recommendations to better meet the need of the CFLRP. 2. Relatively little is known about the abundance, distribution, and, to a certain extent, habitat associations of wildlife species associated with lower montane forests in the Front Range. By actively monitoring populations, wildlife relationship to landscape condition and response to treatments can help better understand impacts to wildlife populations, as well as help inform future management when wildlife habitat restoration is an objective. Wildlife monitoring is a key component of adaptive management in the Front Range. 3. Developing monitoring recommendations and implementing an active wildlife population monitoring program in support of the CFLRP during 2014 will allow an adequate period (approx 10 years, dependent on funding) to examine long-term responses to restoration treatments. Additionally, establishing a long-term monitoring program now should help strengthen the collaborative by engaging other partners in wildlife monitoring and will set the stage for continued monitoring beyond the timeframe of the CFLRP.
--