

 <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, July 23, 2013</p>

<b>Meeting Name</b>	Monthly Meeting – July 2013
<b>Meeting Date</b>	Tuesday, July 23, 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), Janelle Valladares (US Forest Service, PSICC), Summer Grimes (CSU MS Student)

**Meeting Notes**

**1) Introduction and Ice Breaker**

**2) Updates and Meeting Agenda**

a) Discussion about recent field trips

- Those who could attend enjoyed the trip and shared their experiences with Wildlife Team members who could not attend
- Gali suggested that the team put together observations and feedback in time for the Q3 Roundtable meeting

b) Felix – bats

- Spoke with Mikele Painter
  - Mikele suggested that Townsend’s and Fringe Myotis are far too rare to monitor in the CFRLP area
- Felix – unsure if only one of the four potential species makes sense for monitoring and suggested that “bats” serve as a functional group. The group agreed and leaned toward bats as a primary group rather than choosing one specific species.
- Rick
  - Asked Felix: Collectively, in the lower montane, how ecologically informative would bats be, and if it is 2 or 3, can you provide rationale? Felix could not currently provide a rationale for bats as a whole. He will look for more information.
  - There may be a way to measure habitat as an index of population based on bat roosting habitats, etc. Roosting habitat MAY be more of a limiting factor than foraging habitat, but he suggested for Felix to follow up with Mikele Painter to get an expert opinion.

- Rick does not believe that bats can be monitored effectively although they have significant ecological considerations.
- The group suggests dropping bats. They are on the list due to ecological considerations, but should ultimately be dropped due to the difficulty and expense of monitoring.

c) Lynne

- Reviewed a note that Steve sent about the Red-naped Sapsucker.
  - Steve suggests dropping them from primary to secondary due to habitats – primarily Aspen dwellers
- Lynne and Rick are shooting for an August 15 meeting with Yvette. Yvette wants to know undesirable conditions at the landscape scale as well as desired conditions, drivers and consequences for landscape level changes.

d) Janelle – Invertebrates

- Mikele Painter connected Janelle with Dr. Boris Kondratieff, an entomologist.
- Following her discussion with Dr. Kondratieff, she suggested the Carabid Beetle as a primary species
  - Pitfall traps can be used for monitoring

**3) Lunch – 11:30 AM -12:00 PM**

**4) Launch Discussion**

a) “Divide and Conquer”

- Rick
  - Has a clustering of who/how the work should continue
  - The team should start planning logistics and review possible monitoring protocols and cost.
    - Ex. Integrated Bird Monitoring and cost
  - Splitting the team into task groups:
    - Group 1 – Mechanics. Planning, costs, logistics, GIS. Protocols: choosing locations on the landscape where monitoring efforts and techniques make sense. Methods: Comb through material to identify how to monitor, how many people are required, during what time of the day monitoring should take place, etc. Anything that will influence cost. Lynne is the “Task Master”.
    - Group 2 – Science. Experimental design aspect of Groups 1’s work. Potential population responses and metrics (reproductive success, total population size, number of females, occupancy, etc.). Rick is the “Task Master”.
    - Group 3 – Writers. Lynne is the “Task Master”.
    - Group 4 – Facilitation.
    - Rick also suggests a possible Group 5 to develop four plausible scenarios of what may happen on the landscape

- The team's interest in specific groups:
  - Casey: 1,2
  - Lynne: 1,3
  - Janelle: 1
  - Felix: 1,3
  - Steve (absent): the team suggests 2 for him
  - Jenny (absent): the team feels that she would be great at the final review
  - Rick: 2,3 with consultation on 1
  - Terra: 3

b) Updated Primary Species List, after dropping Red-naped Sapsucker

- 1) SCAB – Abert's Squirrel
- 2) ERDO – Porcupine
- 3) NOGO – Northern Goshawk
- 4) FLOW – Flamulated Owl
- 5) Carabid Beetle
- 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
- 12) Bats (will eventually move to secondary)

c) Rick – Timeline suggestion for the August 20<sup>th</sup> meeting

- 1 hr primer on project monitoring and experimental design
- 1 hr method report. Follow the primer with a report from Group 1 that highlights what protocols are available for some of the taxa and what state variable/pop response variable is being targeted by the protocol (occupancy, number of females, etc.)
- 30 minutes to discuss how to move forward
- After lunch, team members should work independently
- Each group reports back at the end of the day with a plan of action and ideas about how to move forward
- In the meantime, the writing group can come up with a general outline

d) Before the August meeting, all team members will do individual "brain dumps" to collect and organize all relevant information on primary species

- Jenny – Mammals
- Lynne – Amphibians and Reptiles
- Casey – Ungulates and Birds
- Janelle – Fish and Invertebrates
- Felix – Bats

**5) Meeting Conclusion:**

- a) The next meeting is Tuesday, 8/20/13 at 740 Simms Street, Golden, CO 80401 in the Cargill Room.
  - The meeting will be longer than usual: 9am-4pm.