

April 23 CFLRP Wildlife Meeting:

## GROUP DISCUSSION AND REVIEW OF BROAD SPECIES GROUPS

### Mammals

#### Carnivores:

- Pros: High trophic positions, KEFs,
- Cons: habitat generalists, population responses may be slow relative to management vs. other stressors, wide ranging,
- Other considerations: not much data CFLRP wide
- FQ: notes re: FECO. May make sense to monitor some of the big-ticket prey items rather than the predator.
- JB: Iconic? Public interest in general. Concern about management impacts may not be accurate?
- Monitoring techniques may be costly, labor intensive etc.
- Initial group recommendation- keep as a group for now, may be good secondary species.

#### Tree squirrels:

- Pros: Very informative (wicked informative) re: lower montane / mgmt.; iconic (esp. Abert's); politically prudent
- Cons: monitoring methods?

- Monitoring techniques- live trapping potentially costly and with mortality concerns; unknowns about techniques
- **Recommendation: retain as potential primary species** but need to carefully review monitoring techniques etc
- Some data available to inform monitoring, though probably not adopt wholesale (ie., to meet CFLRP spatial / temporal needs and design considerations)

#### Bats:

- Pros: sampling methods well developed; public interest
- Cons: not sure what they will tell us – need info (foraging, roosting, etc), species detail; available information may limit utility. Off-site stressors.
- Recommendation: primary? Really need more info. Perhaps indirectly via CSE for tree-roosters?
- 

#### Ungulates:

- Pros: Management likely to impact habitat / populations; lots of data for some species; iconic etc; mule deer winter range within CFLRP; too many critters and informative via negative impacts? Need to hone in on ecologically informative stuff.
- Cons: game species; tough to derive population response for all sorts of reasons
- Does literature support general improvements to condition over winter relative to treatments? If yes, then population / distribution really of interest rather than metrics of habitat quality.

- Recommendation: Consider monitoring **mule deer** or elk as primary? Distribution? Habitat monitoring emphasis? Browse surveyed via existing veg approaches? Forage quantity measurement? State should do this? Partnership? Secondary species via certain techniques (e.g., pellet counts)? Primary for other response variables?

#### Shrews and pocket gophers:

- **Need more info.**
- Pros: small mammals are pretty informative in general... Tied to down woody debris, very specific microhabitat. Small ranging.
- Cons: labor intensive; uncertainty about genetics etc may influence what we can / should do. Small ranging. **Mortality concerns** with some / most of field methods.
- Recommendation: keep group for further consideration. Do we need to go back to list for another small mammal not subject to trapping / sampling mortality?

#### Other: porcupine and beaver

- Pros: ERDO – treatments likely impact probably a bit more informative than CACA; CACA – iconic (good and bad), engineers, some treatments may improve habitat
- Cons:
- Sampling approaches unk.
- Recommendation: Need more info, particularly for ERDO. CACA probably not appropriate for primary.

## Birds

### Everything else (big list)

- Pros: some will be good primary; many ecological functions involved in this group...
- Cons: some will not be good primary
- Recommendation: this group really needs some work. Likely to carry some forward as primary and many as secondary via common protocols. Small group focus on this.

## Owls

- Pros: survey methods in place; food web considerations; relatively easy to survey;
- Cons: timing of surveys may be tricky... (season and time of day); implementation CFLRP wide a challenge?
- Recommendation: need to keep owls and / or raptors, challenge will be identifying primary vs. secondary.
- MESPOW not a good candidate in general
- Flam approach Robert S.

## Woodpeckers

- Pros: abundance and diversity informative of overall CFLRP conditions and objectives; KEFs somewhat different- cavity creation
- Cons:

- Recommendation: need to keep woodpeckers, challenge will be identifying primary vs. secondary.
- Does one of our resident woodpeckers want more open, savannah-like lower montane? Need info.

## Raptors

- Pros: iconic; food web; high site fidelity for most
- Cons: how much value will they have? NOGO: Generalist outside nesting requirements?
- Recommendation: need to keep owls and / or raptors, challenge will be identifying primary vs. secondary.

## Reptiles

- Pros: Small ranges
- Cons: Small ranges; habitat specificity for riparian / rock outcrops etc.
- Recommendation: Not likely to be informative. Tentatively do not carry forward; LD will document why we have cut and team will discuss, agree, disagree. LD's work may reveal one or more species (e.g., short-horned lizard) makes sense to keep for consideration.

## Inverts

## Bark beetles

- Pros: informative and obviously important
- Cons: not good wildlife investment
- Recommendation: drop from our consideration; not an emphasis for wildlife team; attack status falls into CSE domain

## Moths / skippers / friends

- Pros: good relationship to restoration treatments?
- Cons: Climate / weather may outweigh treatment effects
- Recommendation: Generally lacking info / detailed knowledge. Need more info to determine value of a primary species... Host species response to management?

## Amphibians

- Pros: invasive interesting / important, etc but
- Cons: really not suited for response to PIPO restoration objectives
- Recommendation: "Thumbs down"

## Fish

- Pros
- Cons: really not suited for response to PIPO restoration objectives
- Recommendation: “Thumbs down”
- General note: we include considerable mitigation for fish / riparian in planning and implementation