A Preliminary Species Census of Chiroptera in Central Suffolk County

Caitlin White,
Office of Science, Science Undergraduate Laboratory Internship (SULI)
College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Massachusetts

Brookhaven National Laboratory
Upton, New York
August 12th, 2011

Participant: _____

Research Advisor: _____

Table of Contents

Abstract

A Preliminary Species Census of Chiroptera in Central Suffolk County. Caitlin White (College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, MA 01610), Tim Green, Kathy Schwager (Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY 11793).

Many species of Chiroptera are able to produce ultrasonic sounds that are functionally generated for feeding and navigation purposes. These high-frequency pitches are not only functional for the mammal itself, but also aid scientists in identifying each different species of Chiroptera. There have been very few studies of the Chiroptera species, summer roosts, and foraging behaviors performed on Long Island, New York. We have been collecting acoustic data to determine the various species of Chiroptera located in central Suffolk County during the summer months. Using a binary acoustic frequency detector and its complementary computer software, which converts echolocation ultrasounds into sounds audible to the human ear, we collected our data from four different predetermined routes at the peak hours of activity. After collecting these data, we analyzed each call, matching up the frequency of the pitch to the correlating Chiroptera species. Of the 16 acoustic surveys we completed and analyzed, we identified seven different species currently roosting in central Suffolk County; namely, *Eptesicus fuscus, Lasiurus borealis, Lasiurus cinereus, Perimyotis subflavus, Myotis septentrionalis, Myotis leibii,* and Unknown Myotis species. The most prevalent of these species, *E. fuscus*, was identified multiple times in nearly each of the surveys completed. One issue with our research is that the results are slightly biased to Chiroptera that forage along road corridors, which does not fully account for those species who forage in dense forests or above the tree canopy. To eliminate this bias, we would have to cast mist nests above the tree canopy and deep in the forests to capture and identify those species. Another issue with our research lies in the analysis of the frequencies of each call. Though we are able to positively identify some species with ease, other species emit variable calls, which makes identification much more difficult and less exact. These species cannot be positively identified and must be labeled "unknown" until a more precise means of identification through computer software is created. By knowing which species of Chiroptera visit Long Island during the summer months, we will be able to complete future studies regarding each species' roosting and foraging behaviors, fluctuations in numbers in populations of each species, or shifts in geographic distribution.

Introduction

Recently, the mammal order Chiroptera (commonly known as bats) has attracted a

significant amount of attention due to the decline in several species' populations. Many of these

species have experienced drastic declines and shifts in population, distribution, and abundance in

the United States' Northeastern region. The drop in numbers may be attributed to various factors,

such as human disturbance and expansion, deforestation, climate change, disease, and wind

turbines (Kunz and Fenton). One disease in particular, white-nose syndrome (WNS), which

many scientists claim is spreading rapidly to several states in the New England and Mid-Atlantic regions, is responsible for hundreds of thousands of mortalities in cave-dwelling bats (Meteyer et al.). The implication of these combined factors results in the rapid decrease of individuals in bat populations, as well as a significant increase in scientific studies conducted on bat populations. These studies aim to identify each species and their abundance in particular locations, so that future studies may be done and to enable appropriate conservation and protection policies to be put into effect. New York has completed several of these studies, mainly because WNS was first documented in a cave near Albany in 2006 (Blehert et al.). However, little research has been done regarding bat populations on Long Island, New York. As of June 2011, we have conducted a considerable number of acoustic surveys to determine the various species of Chiroptera that roost in central Suffolk County during the summer months. Our objective in conducting this research is to facilitate a better understanding of which species reside on Long Island, so that further studies may be completed on the fluctuating numbers in populations of each species or the shifts in geographic distribution. These studies will ultimately assist in efforts to promote bat species conservation.

Study Area

The area in which our research was conducted consisted primarily of the Pine Barrens in central Suffolk County, Long Island, New York (see Fig.1). The Pine Barrens are a state-protected forest area that "overlies a part of Long Island's federally designated sole source drinking water aquifer," (Central Pine Barrens Joint Planning and Policy Commission). The Pine Barrens encompass several ponds and marsh complexes, as well the Peconic and Carmans Rivers, and occupies 102,500 acres in its entirety. The pitch pine and oak communities that make up a significant portion of the tree species in the Pine Barrens has a 60% canopy cover (U.S. Fish

and Wildlife Service). We traveled throughout and around a significant portion of the Pine Barrens. We also extended our research onto the North Fork on our Sound Avenue route, to account for the agricultural landscapes that may host bats' summer roosts. In addition, we conducted a limited number of static surveys around the Brookhaven National Laboratory located in Upton, New York.

Methods and Materials

Surveys were completed around central Suffolk County four times each, on four separate predetermined routes. These routes were selected due to their presumed likelihood of containing bats in summer roosts. The routes were conducted during the peak hours of activity for most Chiroptera species, beginning one-half hour from sunset (Bat Acoustic Survey Protocols). A binary acoustic frequency detector was used to receive the bat calls and provide recordings of the ultrasonic frequencies onto a laptop through its complementary computer software, Spect'R®. These recordings convert echolocation ultrasounds into sounds audible to the human ear and denote the minimum frequency of each call (Binary Acoustic Technology, LLC). This binary acoustic frequency detector and a GPS locator were placed on the roof of our vehicle. While on route, a software program (DeLorme 2009) logged our specific GPS locations in accordance with the time. During the survey, we traveled at an average speed of 20 miles per hour, which is comparable to the speed of a bat itself. Before and after the survey was in session, we collected weather data, noting the temperature, wind speed, wind direction, relative humidity, and dew point.

After collecting these data, we ran every sound file captured by Spect'R® through another computer program, Scan'R®, which isolated each bat vocalization and separated out positive bat calls to be analyzed by hand (Binary Acoustic Technology LLC). We then went

through each sequence of bat calls, further separating files with search phase calls from calls consisting of approach phase or feeding buzzes. When bat species use echolocation, calls change in structure throughout the sequence from detection of prey, to the approach and capture of the prey (Kunz and Fenton). Search phase calls, often emitted at the rate of one per wing beat, are evenly spaced and consistent (Carl Herzog 7/6). When prey is detected, calls in the approach phase become shorter, thus closer together, and drop in slope and frequency (kHz), ending in a terminal "feeding buzz" (Kunz and Fenton). For the most accurate identification of a Chiroptera species, it is essential that only a significant sequence of search phase calls are used (Carl Herzog 7/6). We analyzed the search phase calls, noting the minimum frequencies of each call and matched up the frequency of the pitch to the correlating Chiroptera species as specified on the chart designed by New York State's Department of Environmental Conservation Wildlife Biologist, Carl Herzog. We then carefully cataloged this information for its use in additional and future Chiroptera studies in central Suffolk County.

Results

According to the data obtained and analyzed from our mobile acoustic surveys, we have identified seven different Chiroptera species roosting in central Suffolk County, Long Island. These species include *Eptesicus fuscus, Lasiurus borealis, Lasiurus cinereus, Perimyotis subflavus, Myotis septentrionalis, Myotis leibii,* and Unknown Myotis species. Out of 163 positive bat calls received, analyzed, and logged, 77.30% of those calls were identified as *E. fuscus*. *L. borealis* comprised 13. 49% of the identified species, while *P. subflavus* and *L. cinereus* each made up 1.22% and *M. septentrionalis* made up .61% of the identified Chiroptera. *L. cinereus* and *M. leibii* were also identified in the limited number of static acoustic surveys conducted at several ponds located on Brookhaven National Laboratory's property; however,

results of these data can not be quantified. The remaining 6.13% of positive bat calls analyzed

were unable to be definitively identified and must be placed under the Unknown Myotis

classification.

Discussion

Scientific studies conducted on bat populations usually consist of either acoustic surveys

or mist-net captures (however, using both methods combined is considered more thorough). Our

research was conducted using acoustic technology due to the lack of time, animal handling

expertise, and funds. Acoustic survey methods were appropriate for our research because they

are more effective in sampling a larger area than mist-netting capture techniques (O'Farrell and

Gannon). Although acoustic bat surveys cannot measure the long-term behavioral patterns or

definitively enumerate the population size, they are adequate at monitoring a species' existence

in specific locations, as well as their habitat preference (Rodhouse et al). Kunz and Fenton

further describe the importance of acoustic surveys when stating,

> Detecting changes in populations not only allows those species threatened with local or
> global extinction to be identified but also helps to pinpoint likely cause of declines
> through correlation and direct experimentation. Monitoring of bats could in turn become
> a useful tool for detecting far reaching environmental changes (687).

Furthermore, because Long Island has not conducted research on bat populations since the early

1970s, our acoustic research is significant because of its ability to help update the species

abundance data.

However, there are some biases and challenges associated with acoustic surveying

methods. One challenge encountered in these surveys is that the background noise picked up

from vehicle traffic and insect activity can overwhelm the acoustic detector's sensitivity,

compromising the call quality of the bat's search-phase pulses (Rodhouse et al.). One bias that

the acoustic method introduces is the tendency to favor species that forage along road corridors,

failing to account for the species that hunt and feed in dense forests (Carl Herzog 7/6). To eliminate this bias, we would have to cast mist nests above the tree canopy and deep in the forests to capture and identify those species. We experienced another obstacle with our research while attempting to analyze the frequencies of each call. Though we are able to positively identify some species with ease, other species emit variable calls that make identification more difficult and less exact. These species cannot be positively identified and must be labeled "unknown" until a more precise means of identification through computer software is created (Carl Herzog 7/6).

In the Northeast region, 10 different species can be found, although some are exceptionally rare and only found in select states (such as *Myotis sodalis*). These species include *Eptesicus fuscus, Myotis lucifugus, Lasiurus borealis, Lasionycteris noctivagans, Myotis septentrionalis, Perimyotis subflavus, Lasiurus cinereus, Myotis sodalis, Myotis leibii,* and *Nycticeius humeralis* (Batcon). As seen from our results, *E. fuscus* (commonly known as big brown bats) make up a significant percentage of the bats found roosting in central Suffolk County, New York. As acknowledged by Carl Herzog, corroborating evidence from summer mist-netting research conducted in other areas of the state suggest that big brown bats are high in abundance in New York (Carl Herzog 7/21). However, he also noted that acoustic detection methods favor big brown bats due to their tendency and preference to forage along roads and open canopies (Carl Herzog 7/21).

The outcome of our data is significant because it demonstrates the shift in species abundance with a serious decline of *M. lucifugus* (commonly known as the little brown bat) found in central Suffolk County. According to data logged in the early 1970s little brown bats "...appeared to be the most numerous summer bat over most of Eastern Long Island," (Connor

16). Many scientists attribute the significant decline in abundance and distribution of the little brown bat species across New York state to their susceptibility to WNS. The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation claims that little brown, northern, and tricolored bats have been the most affected by the disease, with population declines of more than 90% since 2006 (NYS DEC). A similar scientific study conducted in New England claims that the Myotis species detected during the summer months have declined 72% since 2006, consequently drawing the conclusion that the decline in summer activity and abundance are likely from winter mortalities due to WNS (Brooks). Brooks also notes, "This conclusion is reinforced by the lack of a simultaneous decline in the summer activity of bat species less impacted by white nose syndrome," which would include big brown bats.

Our preliminary research of the Chiroptera species will allow future studies to be conducted on Long Island regarding population distribution and abundance. By knowing which species of Chiroptera visit Long Island during the summer months, scientists will now be able to observe and research population declines due to the many factors working against bat species' survival. It is important for conservation policies to be put into effect in a timely manner, protecting those species that are experiencing severe declines in abundance. Policy and conservation measures cannot be taken without the information obtained from our essential research and subsequent studies.

Acknowledgments

References

Batcon. "Species Profiles." Bat Conservation International, Inc. 2011.
    http://www.batcon.org/index.php/all-about-bats/species-profiles.html

Binary Acoustic Technology LLC. "Product details - binary acoustic technology." 19 July 2011.
    http://www.binaryacoustictech.com/batpages_files/ar180.htm

Blehert, David S. "Bat White-Nose Syndrome: An Emerging Fungal Pathogen?" Science Vol
    323. 9 January 2009. www.sciencemag.org

Brooks, Robert T. "Declines in summer bat activity in central New England 4 years following the
    initial detections of white-nose syndrome." Brooks Springer Science. +Business Media
    B.V. 18 January 2011.

Connor, Paul F. The Mammals of Long Island, New York 1971. New York State Museum and
    Science Service. 1971.

Ed. Thomas H Kunz, Thomas H. and M. Brock Fenton. Bat Ecology. The University of Chicago
    Press: Chicago 2003. 60-687.

Herzog, Carl. "Bat Acoustic Survey Protocols." New York State Department of Environmental
    Conservation. 26 April 2011.

Herzog, Carl. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. Personal
    Communication. Conference Call. July 6th 2011.

Herzog, Carl. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. Personal
    Communication. Email Correspondence. July 21st 2011.

Meteyer, Carol Uphoff et al. "Histopathologic criteria to confirm white-nose syndrome in bats." J
    Vet Diagn Invest 21:411-414 (2009).

New York State's Central Pine Barrens. "Pine Barrens Region" Central Pine Barrens Joint
    Planning and Policy Commission, 2011. 20 July 2011. http://pb.state.ny.us/#Region

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. "White-nose syndrome likely in all
    New York State Bat Caves." Environmental DEC. December 2010.

http://www.dec.ny.gov/environmentdec/70125.html

O'Farrell, Michael J. and William L. Gannon. "A Comparison of Acoustic Versus Capture
    Techniques for the Inventory of Bats." Journal of Mammalogy, 80 (1). 1999.

Rodhouse, Thomas J., Kerri T. Vierling, Kathryn M. Irvine. "A Practical Sampling Design for
    Acoustic Survey of Bats." Journal of Wildlife Management Vol 75 (5). July 2011. 1094-
1102.

Significant Habitats and Habitat Complexes of the New York Bight Watershed. "Long Island
    Pine Barrens - Peconic River Complex" U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 20 July 2011.
    http://library.fws.gov/pubs5/web_link/text/li_pine.htm

Figures

Fig.1