

CARNIVORE SCENT STATION SURVEY

AND

WINTER TRACK INDICES

NOTE: This survey is organized and coordinated by the Forest Wildlife Populations and Research Group, 1201 E. Hwy 2, Grand Rapids, MN 55744. Results are presented at this location in the book because of the statewide nature of the data.

FURBEARER WINTER TRACK SURVEY SUMMARY, 2008

John Erb, Forest Wildlife Populations and Research Group, DNR

INTRODUCTION

Monitoring the distribution and abundance of carnivores can be important for documenting the effects of harvest, habitat change, and environmental variability on these populations. However, many carnivores are highly secretive, difficult to repeatedly capture, and naturally occur at low to moderate densities, making it difficult to estimate abundance over large areas using traditional methods (e.g., mark-recapture, distance sampling, etc.). Hence, indices of relative abundance are often used to monitor such populations over time (Hochachka et al. 2000, Wilson and Delahay 2001, Conn et al. 2004).

In winter, tracks of carnivores are readily observable following snowfall. Starting in 1991, Minnesota initiated a carnivore snow track survey in the northern portion of the State. The survey's primary objective is to use a harvest-independent method to monitor distribution and population trends of fisher (*Martes pennanti*) and marten (*Martes americana*), 2 species for which no other survey data was available. Because sign of other carnivores is readily detectable in snow, participants also record tracks for other selected species. After 3 years of evaluating survey logistics, the survey became operational in 1994.

METHODS

Presently, 58 track survey routes are distributed across the northern portion of the state (Figure 1). Each route is 10 miles long and follows secondary roads or trails. Route locations were subjectively determined based on availability of suitable roads/trails, but were chosen, where possible, to represent the varying forest habitat conditions in northern Minnesota. For data recording, each 10-mile route is divided into 20 0.5-mile segments.

Each route is surveyed once following a fresh snow typically from December through mid-February, and track counts are recorded for each 0.5-mile segment. When it is obvious the same animal crossed the road multiple times within a 0.5-mile segment, the animal is only recorded once. If it is obvious that an animal ran along the road and entered multiple 0.5 mile segments (which often occurs with canids), its' tracks are recorded in all segments, but circled to denote it was the same animal. While such duplicate tracks are not included in calculation of track indices (see below), recording data in this manner allows for future analysis of animal activity in relation to survey 'plot' size and habitat. Snowshoe hare (*Lepus americanus*) are recorded only as present or absent in the first 0.1 miles of each 0.5-mile segment. While most routes are surveyed 1 day after the conclusion of a snowfall (ending by 6:00 pm), thereby allowing 1 night for track 'registry', a few routes are usually completed 2 nights following snowfall. In such cases, track counts on those routes are divided by the number of days post-snowfall.

Currently, 3 summary statistics (2 graphs) are presented for each species. First, I compute the percentage of 0.5-mile segments with species presence after removing any duplicates (e.g., if the same fox clearly traverses 2 adjacent 0.5-mile segments along the road, and it was the only 'new' red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) in the second segment, only 1 of the 2 segments is considered independently occupied). In addition to this metric, but on the same graph, the average number of tracks per 10-mile route is presented after removing any obvious duplicate tracks across segments. For wolves (*Canis lupus*) traveling through adjacent segments, the maximum number of pack members recorded in any 1 of those segments is used as the track total for that particular group, though this is likely an underestimate of true pack size. Because

individuals from many of the species surveyed tend to be solitary, these 2 indices will often yield mathematically equivalent results (i.e., on average, one tends to differ from the other by a constant factor). In the case of wolf packs, and to a lesser extent red fox and coyotes (*Canis latrans*) which may start traveling as breeding pairs in winter, the approximate equivalence of these 2 indices will still be true if average (detected) group sizes are similar across years. However, the solitary tendencies in some species are not absolute, potential abundance (in relation to survey plot size) varies across species, and for wolves, pack size may vary annually. For these reasons, as well as to provide an intuitive count metric, both indices are currently presented. Because snowshoe hares are tallied only as present/absent, the 2 indices will by definition be equivalent. Hare survey data is also obtained via counts of animals observed on grouse drumming count surveys conducted in spring. Data for both the spring and winter indices are presented for comparison.

In the second graph for each species, I illustrate the percentage of routes where each species was detected (hereafter, the 'distribution index'). This measure is computed to help assess whether notable changes in the above track indices are a result of larger-scale changes in distribution (more/less routes with presence) and/or finer-scale changes in density along routes.

Using bootstrap methods, I compute confidence intervals (90%) for the percent of segments with species presence and the percent of routes with species presence. For each of 1000 replicates, survey routes are randomly re-sampled according to the observed route sample size. Replicates are ranked according to the magnitude of the calculated index, and the 50th and 950th values constitute the lower and upper bounds of the confidence interval.

RESULTS

Forty-one of the 58 routes were completed this year (Figure 2). Survey routes took an average of 2 hours to complete. Total snow depths averaged 15" for completed routes (Figure 3), the second deepest since the survey was initiated. Similarly, mean overnight low temperature the night preceding the surveys was 0°F, the second coldest since surveys began (Figure 3). Survey routes were completed between November 25th and February 27th this winter, with a mean survey date of January 24th (Figure 3). This was the latest mean survey date since surveys were initiated.

Fisher and marten track indices (% of segments with detection) both declined to their lowest level since the survey began, although neither was a significant decline from the previous year (Figure 4). Fishers were detected on 54% of the routes, the lowest since the survey was initiated (Figure 4). Marten were detected on 46% of the survey routes, a slight but non-significant increase from last year (Figure 4).

Little change was observed in bobcat (*Lynx rufus*), wolf, and weasel (*Mustela* spp.) indices (Figure 4). Wolves were detected on 71% of survey routes, while bobcats were detected on 41% of survey routes. Red fox track indices rebounded some after a significant decline last year (Figure 4). Nevertheless, fox indices remain low in comparison to previous years. Based on track indices, coyotes, typically the least detected species, declined appreciably from last year. Considering past cyclic tendencies, snowshoe hare indices had been expected to decline in recent years. However, neither the spring nor winter snowshoe hare indices have consistently declined during this time (Figure 4).

DISCUSSION

Reliable interpretation of changes in track survey results is dependent on the assumption that the probability of detecting animals remains relatively constant across years (Gibbs 2000) Because this remains an untested assumption, caution is warranted when interpreting changes, particularly annual changes of low to moderate magnitude, or short-term trends. Of particular note this year, track routes

were, on average, surveyed later in winter than ever before. Snow depths were also the second deepest since the survey began, while average temperature was the second coldest. Combined, these conditions could potentially cause a reduction in animal movement, thereby lowering track indices.

Based on confidence intervals, none of the observed changes from last year were statistically significant. However, the decline in coyote and marten indices approached significance, as did the increase in the red fox index. Confidence interval data for all previous years will be available in next year's report.

Two new survey routes were added this year, and I continue to review the adequacy of survey route sample size and distribution. We have also initiated fisher and marten research that, among other things, should provide some evaluation of track survey assumptions and possible approaches for estimating, and hence correcting for, any differences in the probability of detecting animals across years (e.g., MacKenzie et al. 2004).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank all those who participated in this year's survey, including DNR field staff, USFS-Ely, Fond-du-Lac, Leech Lake, and Red Lake Bands, and the 1854 Treaty Authority.

LITERATURE CITED

CONN, P. B., L. L. BAILEY, and J. R. SAUER. 2004. Indexes as surrogates to abundance for low-abundance species. Pages 59-76 *in* W. L. Thompson, editor. *Sampling rare or elusive species: Concepts, designs, and techniques for estimating population parameters*. Island Press, Washington, D.C., USA.

GIBBS, J. P. 2000. Monitoring populations. Pages 213-252 *in* L. Boitani and T. K. Fuller, editors. *Research Techniques in Animal Ecology*. Columbia University Press, New York, USA.

HOCHACHKA, W. M., K. MARTIN, F. DOYLE, and C. J. KREBS. 2000. Monitoring vertebrate populations using observational data. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 78:521-529.

MACKENZIE, D. I., J. A. ROYLE, J. A. BROWN, and J. D. NICHOLS. 2004. Occupancy estimation and modeling for rare and elusive populations. Pages 149-172 *in* W. L. Thompson, editor. *Sampling rare or elusive species: Concepts, designs, and techniques for estimating population parameters*. Island Press, Washington, D.C., USA.

WILSON, G. J., and R. J. DELAHAY. 2001. A review of methods to estimate the abundance of terrestrial carnivores using field signs and observation. *Wildlife Research* 28:151-164.




Figure 1. Locations of established furbearer winter track survey routes.




Figure 2. Number of winter track routes surveyed, 1994-2008.






Figure 3. Average winter track survey date, snow depth, and temperature, 1994-2008.




Figure 4. Winter track indices for selected species in Minnesota.




Figure 4 (continued). Winter track indices for selected species in Minnesota.

CARNIVORE SCENT STATION SURVEY SUMMARY, 2008

John Erb, Forest Wildlife Populations and Research Group

INTRODUCTION

Monitoring the distribution and abundance of carnivores can be important for documenting the effects of harvest, habitat change, and environmental variability on these populations. However, many carnivores are highly secretive, difficult to repeatedly capture, and naturally occur at low to moderate densities, making it difficult to estimate abundance over large areas using traditional methods (e.g., mark-recapture, distance sampling, etc.). Hence, indices of relative abundance are often used to monitor such populations over time (Sargeant et al. 1998, 2003, Hochachka et al. 2000, Wilson and Delahay 2001, Conn et al. 2004).

In the early 1970's, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service initiated a carnivore survey designed primarily to monitor trends in coyote populations in the western U.S. (Linhart and Knowlton 1975). In 1975, the Minnesota DNR began to utilize similar survey methodology to monitor population trends for numerous terrestrial carnivores within the state. This year marks the 33rd anniversary of the carnivore scent station survey.

METHODS

Scent station survey routes are composed of tracking stations (0.9 m diameter circle) of sifted soil with a fatty-acid scent tab placed in the middle. Scent stations are spaced at 0.5 km intervals on alternating sides of a road. During the initial years (1975-82), survey routes were 23.7 km long, with 50 stations per route. Stations were checked for presence/absence of tracks on 4 consecutive nights (old tracks removed each night), and the mean number of station visits per night was the basis for subsequent analysis. Starting in 1983, following suggestions by Roughton and Sweeny (1982), design changes were made whereby routes were shortened to 4.3 km, 10 stations/route (still with 0.5 km spacing between stations), and routes were surveyed only once on the day following route placement. The shorter routes and fewer checks allowed for an increase in the number and geographic distribution of survey routes. In either case, the design can be considered two-stage cluster sampling.

Survey routes were selected non-randomly, but with the intent of maintaining a minimum 5 km separation between routes, and encompassing the variety of habitat conditions within the work area of each survey participant. Most survey routes are placed on secondary (unpaved) roads/trails, and are completed from September through October. Survey results are currently stratified based on 3 'habitat zones' within the state (forest, farmland, and transition).

Track presence/absence is recorded at each station, and track indices are computed as the percentage of scent stations visited by each species. Confidence intervals (95%) are computed using bootstrap methods (percentile method; Thompson et al. 1998). For each of 1000 replicates, survey routes are randomly re-sampled according to observed zone-specific route sample sizes, and station visitation rates are computed for each replicate sample of routes. Replicates are ranked according to the magnitude of the calculated index, and the 25th and 975th values constitute the lower and upper bounds of the confidence interval.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A total of 303 routes were completed this year (Figure 1). There were 2,878 operable scent stations examined on the 303 4.3 km routes. Route density varied from 1 route per 528 km² in the Forest zone to 1 route per 1,216 km² in the Farmland zone (Figure 1).

Statewide, route visitation rates (% of routes with detection) were highest for red fox (39%), followed by skunk (37%), domestic cat (35%), raccoon (34%), coyote (26%), and dog (19%). Regionally, route visitation rates were as follows: red fox – Farmland (FA) 23%, Transition (TR) 40%, Forest (FO) 44%; coyote – FA 41%, TR 29%, FO 19%; skunk – FA 48%, TR 46%, FO 27%; raccoon – FA 64%, TR 39%, FO 20%; domestic cat – FA 70%, TR 44%, FO 17%; and dog – FA 30%, TR 26%, FO 11%. Figures 2-5 show station visitation indices (% of stations visited) from the survey's inception through the current year.

Although the survey is largely intended to document long-term trends in populations, confidence intervals improve interpretation of the significance of annual changes. Based on the presence/absence of confidence interval overlap, there were no significant changes from last year.

While multiple factors can influence abundance, fox indices remain lowest in the zone with the highest coyote index (Farmland), while coyote indices are lowest in the zone where wolves are most abundant (Forest). Point estimates for the red fox index in the Farmland and Transition zones remain well below their long-term average (Figures 2 and 3), likely a combined result of increasing coyote numbers, mange, and habitat alteration. The Farmland coyote index continues its upward trend (Figure 2), while the coyote index in the Forest zone remains below the long-term average (Figure 4). Raccoon indices are highest in the Farmland zone, and above their long-term mean (Figure 2). Recent raccoon indices in both the Transition (Figure 3) and Forest zones (Figure 4) have remained relatively stable near their long-term mean. While not significantly different from recent years, this year's bobcat indices in both the Forest and Transition zones were the highest since the survey was initiated (Figure 5). Wolf indices have not changed appreciably in the last 5 years, and remain slightly above the long-term average (Figure 5).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank all of the cooperators who participated in the 2008 survey: DNR Division of Wildlife staff; Superior National Forest; Agassiz, Rydell, and Sherberne National Wildlife Refuges; USFWS Detroit Lakes Wetland Management District; 1854 Authority, White Earth, Red Lake, and Leech Lake Reservations; Vermillion Community College; Beltrami and Cass County Land Departments; Marshall County Central High School; and Richard Nelles and Tom Stuber.

LITERATURE CITED

- CONN, P. B., L. L. BAILEY, and J. R. SAUER. 2004. Indexes as surrogates to abundance for low-abundance species. Pages 59-76 in W. L. Thompson, editor. *Sampling rare or elusive species: Concepts, designs, and techniques for estimating population parameters*. Island Press, Washington, D.C., USA.
- HOCHACHKA, W. M., K. MARTIN, F. DOYLE, and C. J. KREBS. 2000. Monitoring vertebrate populations using observational data. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 78:521-529.
- LINHART, S. B., and F. F. KNOWLTON. 1975. Determining the relative abundance of coyotes by scent station lines. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 3: 119-124.

- ROUGHTON, R. D., and M. D. SWEENEY. 1982. Refinements in scent-station methodology for assessing trends in carnivore populations. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 46: 217-229.
- SARGEANT, G. A., D. H. JOHNSON, and W. E. BERG. 1998. Interpreting carnivore scent station surveys. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 62: 1235-1245.
- SARGEANT, G. A., D. H. JOHNSON, and W. E. BERG. 2003. Sampling designs for carnivore scent-station surveys. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 67: 289-298.
- THOMPSON, W. L., G. C. WHITE, and C. GOWAN. 1998. *Monitoring vertebrate populations*. Academic Press, San Diego, California.
- WILSON, G. J., and R. J. DELEHAY. 2001. A review of methods to estimate the abundance of terrestrial carnivores using field signs and observation. *Wildlife Research* 28:151-164.




Figure 1. Locations of scent station routes. Insets show 2008 route specifics and the number of station-nights per year since 1983.









Figure 2. Percentage of scent stations visited by selected species in the Farmland Zone of Minnesota, 1977-2008. Horizontal line represents long-term mean.









Figure 3. Percentage of scent stations visited by selected species in the Transition Zone of Minnesota, 1978-2008. Horizontal line represents long-term mean.









Figure 4. Percentage of scent stations visited by selected species in the Forest Zone of Minnesota, 1976-2008. Horizontal line represents long-term mean.







Figure 5. Percentage of scent stations visited by wolves and bobcat in the Forest and Transition Zones of Minnesota, 1976-2008. Horizontal lines represents long-term mean.

