

 <p><b>Front Range Roundtable</b> Fuels Treatment Partnership</p>	<p><b>Monthly Meeting</b></p>	<p><b>Wildlife Working Team</b></p>
<p>Created by: Summer Grimes</p>	<p><i>Meeting Minutes</i></p>	<p>Tuesday, June 18, 2013</p>

<b>Meeting Name</b>	Monthly Meeting – June 2013
<b>Meeting Date</b>	Tuesday, June 18, 2013
<b>Meeting Time</b>	10:00 AM – 3:00 PM MDT
<b>Venue</b>	740 Simms Street, Golden, CO, 80401
<b>Attendees</b>	Gali Beh (Beh Consulting), Terra Lenihan (Beh Consulting), Rick Truex (US Forest Service), Casey Cooley (Colorado Division of Parks and Wildlife), Lynne Deibel (US Forest Service, ARP), Felix Quesada (US Forest Service, PSICC), Steve Germaine (US Geological Survey), Summer Grimes (CSU MS Student)

**Meeting Notes**

**1) Introductions, Ice Breaker and Roundtable Meeting Update**

- a) Casey and Rick – discussed relevant points from the Roundtable Q2 meeting
  - There were concerns/uncertainties surrounding treatment area sizes and effectiveness
  - How you design monitoring and ask questions is crucial – need to remember that there will always be a level of uncertainty and thoroughly explain these reasons to the public
  - USFS representatives were also uncertain about wildlife monitoring
    - Casey – more evidence that the wildlife team needs to be certain about their decisions and provide thorough justifications in the event that they are challenged.

**2) Updates and Meeting Agenda - Lynne**

- a) Gali – Due to personal and business time restrictions, she will continue to facilitate team meetings but Terra Lenihan will now handle supporting documentation, emailing, communication, website, etc.
- b) Lynne gave Gali updates from the last meeting
  - Suggested primary species so far:
    - Porcupine
    - Gosshawk
    - Flammulated Owl
    - Abert’s Squirrel
  - Suggested secondary species so far:
    - Shrews and Gophers – Rick feels that these may need to be dropped. The team will reevaluate
    - Pine Squirrel

- Unsure about:
    - Invertebrates – Janelle (absent) is going to touch base with an entomologist
    - Bats
  
  - Dropped species:
    - Beaver
    - Mexican Spotted Owl
    - Coopers Hawk
    - Sharp-shinned Hawk
    - Pygmy Owl
- c) Gali asked Rick to define primary and secondary
- Primary
    - Species for whom we develop explicit monitoring plans and look for specific responses to treatments. We have the ability to effectively monitor their presumed response to management. They are subject to power analysis, sampling size consideration, etc. Ex. Abert's Squirrel.
  
  - Secondary
    - "Innocent bystanders" of the methods used to survey primary species. Ex. Integrated Bird Monitoring – a primary species of bird is routinely monitored and the techniques used will allow us to observe a suite of other species at no additional cost. May lead to "hidden surprises in unanticipated data".
- d) Discussion about homework assignments
- Janelle – not present so invertebrate information will be discussed in July
  - Casey – Ungulates
    - Recommends all ungulates as secondary because most are generalists
      - Deer and Elk are generalists
      - Sheep are somewhat isolated on the landscape
    - For the sake of the CFLRP, the team needs to look at animals that have the most sensitivity to forest treatments – he does not think that this includes ungulates.
    - It is possible to consider Mule Deer because of their winter range/habitats, but he is not convinced.
    - He does not believe that ungulates will be overly informative for this project
    - Rick – playing "devil's advocate":
      - He agrees with Casey's logic to a degree but points out how Elk are informative because of their disruption to forest processes in addition to their sheer numbers and economic and social importance.
      - Casey believes that there is an overemphasis on game species due to their economic worth
    - Rick walked through the concept of variance buckets using diagrams on a white board

- Felix
  - Bats
    - Roosting habitat is most informative but probably difficult to monitor
    - Feels bats as a group may be secondary, but has had difficulty finding information
    - He needs to explore more and wants to consult with an “expert”
      - Steve said he knows two people at USGS (bat ecologists) – will check with them
    - Rick – some bats should be considered as primary and others as secondary rather than listing the entire group as secondary (measure habitats and roosting material, etc. Ex. Tree-roosting bats)
      - Casey – Silver-haired Bats and Fringe Myotis are the main tree-roosting bats in this area.
    - Group homework – Flesh out information about bats for the next meeting. Goal is to identify a few species and approach an “expert” with questions re: the CFLRP area

e) Lynne will create and maintain a list of experts that the team uses for any species.

### 3) Lunch – 11:30 AM -12:00 PM

### 4) Launch Discussion

- a) Casey/Steve/Lynne – woodpeckers and other birds
- Explained and reviewed spreadsheet organization and columns
    - Casey – They tried to pick a variety of birds that have different foraging guilds and use the landscape a little differently
      - Ex. Williamson’s Sapsucker is a Ponderosa Pine specialist, Olive-sided Flycatcher is a flycatcher/aerial predator, Pygmy Nuthatch is a bark gleaner, Golden-crowned Kinglet is a foliage gleaner, etc.
      - Recommend sampling all birds through Integrated Bird Monitoring
    - Many on the list are primaries and most can be monitored using the same techniques although the ability to measure a response from each species may be different.
      - Suggested primaries:
        1. Red-naped Sapsucker (potential)
        2. Williamson’s Sapsucker
        3. Hairy Woodpecker
        4. Mountain Bluebird
        5. Golden-crowned Kinglet – foliage gleaner

6. Olive-sided Flycatcher – flycatcher / aerial predator
7. Pygmy Nuthatch – bark gleaner

- Suggested secondaries:
  1. Dusty Grouse
  2. Wild Turkey
  3. Brown Creeper
  4. Cassin's Finch
  5. Clark's Nutcracker
- The group discussed the logic/reasoning for the selection of some species
  - Rick – hold onto the logic of using functional roles, range of habitat and elevations, etc. to make sure that other taxa have not been neglected. Important to document this process for the birds so it can be used when considering other taxa. Consistency is very important and this may be an important approach for CFLRP species depending on the treatment area or trigger.
  - Steve – makes the point that adding a few extra sampling points once in the field is not generally overly expensive. Most of the cost is getting to the location rather than sampling one or two additional spots and counting additional species. For the sake of consistency, it may be wise to reduce the number of primaries on the list while keeping in mind that collecting additional secondary information about birds as a group while in the field is relatively easy and inexpensive.
    - Casey – suggested moving Kinglet to a secondary after Steve's comments. He believes Kinglet information will still be collected, but is unsure if the secondary information will be robust enough to make a management decision.
      - Rick agrees with this point and says that is an important question to remember.
    - Steve – asked for clarification about the scope and team's objective before he can agree. Is the group only focused on Ponderosa Pine or does the team also want/need to consider mixed Conifer treatments?
      - Gali – read from the team's Scope: only says "in the CFLRP project area" and does not say "lower montane". She says if mixed conifer is in the CFLRP site, the group needs to think about this and consider monitoring options/logic. Her concern is that the list does not include a primary species that is appropriate for mixed conifer areas.

- Lynne – that was part of their rationale for bringing some of these species forward as primaries; so they could capture those treatments and overlap.
  - Gali – then we need to go back to Rick’s question and think about what species may have been left out because the group wasn’t thinking about mixed conifer.
    - Rick says this may be moot because of other processes used for ranking and selection.
    - Gali will adjust the scope to include mixed conifer and lower montane.
- Rick – simple facets about how “surveyable” a species is will have impacts on what it would cost to get the same level of sampling to draw similar types of inferences based on fundamental challenges to sampling species. This is the type of information we can get to help inform some of the considerations for primaries etc.
    - Casey – to build on that point, every time someone samples in an area, a power analysis begins to develop for how many sites you will need to sample to reduce the variance of a specific species. This information can be very powerful for decision makers.
    - Rick – exactly. You may have to sample twice as intensively to draw the same conclusion about species “x” as species “y”, and this is a very compelling point when discussing the cost of monitoring.

b) Jenny (absent) – Carnivores

- The group briefly reviewed her documents
  - Jenny recommended Mountain Lion as a possible primary with a few conditions/exceptions
    - Rick feels that Mountain Lions will be problematic because they are wide-ranging and so closely tied to ungulate dynamics, persecution, expensive to monitor, etc. Gut feeling – would be very tough to monitor and identify responses.
    - Steve – what response would we measure? Occupancy is possible but hard to tie to any treatment response.
    - Casey – need to be able to explain the logic to people in a generalized way to show that these observations are not “meaningful” with regards to CFLRP treatments regardless of how charismatic the animal may be. Difficult to do.
      - Rick – simply explain that they are very valuable, but less meaningful as it relates to management of the area.

c) Justification and documentation of species status – deferring until next month

d) Hypothesize population responses for primary species only:

- Primary species – The group identified a list of 11 primary species and had a preliminary discussion re: population responses to treatment types, locations, choosing scope, timing of funding, etc. Rick used a white board to draw examples of 12 possible population responses:
  - A) gradual decline
  - B) no change
  - C) gradual increase
  - D) steady then sharp decline
  - E) steady then sharp increase
  - F) small decrease then level off
  - G) small increase then level off
  - H) dramatic increase or dramatic decrease
  - I) sharp decline then level off at low numbers
  - J) sharp increase then level off at high numbers
  - K) unknown
  
- They will continue the discussion during the next meeting following additional research by team members.
  
- Proposed primary species:
  - 1) SCAB – Abert’s Squirrel
  - 2) ERDO – Porcupine
  - 3) NOGO – Northern Goshawk
  - 4) FLOW – Flamulated Owl
  - 5) RNSA – Red-naped Sapsucker
  - 6) WISA – Williamson’s Sapsucker
  - 7) HAWO – Hairy Woodpecker
  - 8) MOBL – Mountain Bluebird
  - 9) GCKI – Golden-crowned Kinglet
  - 10) OSFL – Olive-sided Flycatcher
  - 11) PYNU – Pigmy Nuthatch
  
- Gali – need to do three things for each species:
  - How many sites over how many acres and what response is expected

**b) Meeting Conclusion**

- The group will receive templates around June 27<sup>th</sup> / 28<sup>th</sup> to help guide rationales, etc.
- Rick suggests for the group to read a few documents/important papers so everyone can capture the technical details and gain exposure to the frameworks. Rick suggests the book: The Ecological Detective
  
- Homework:
  - A) Felix – will pursue further information about bats
  - B) Steve – looking into the Red-naped Sapsucker
  - C) Casey – will consult with “experts” re: birds
  - D) Lynne – call Yvette
  - E) Rick – to develop templates for discarding amphibians and keeping the Abert’s Squirrel
  
- The next meeting is Tuesday 7/23/13 at 740 Simms Street, Golden, CO, 80401 in the Cargill Room.