batcon.org BAT CONSERVATION INTERNATIONAL



Southeastern Cave Bats: Reservoirs for Future Populations? Katie Gillies - Bat Conservation International, Southeastern Bat Diversity Network White-nose Syndrome Committee

Introduction

Bat Conservation International and the Southeastern Bat Diversity Network share similar Since 2006, white-nose syndrome (WNS) has devastated bat missions which address bat conservation needs. As such, we partnered to collect, compile, populations across the Eastern United States. The US Fish and synthesize and present the information below. We contacted state biologists in 17 of the 19 Wildlife Service estimates the loss at more than 5.7 million bats. WNS-positive states. As WNS was new to Missouri and Alabama in 2012, we did not request WNS and/or the fungal causative agent, *Geomyces destructans*, has mortality data from either of those states. From each state, we requested **1**) Pre-WNS roost been found in 21 states and 4 Canadian provinces, including AL, KY, estimates, by species, averaged across the states, 2) Post-WNS roost estimates, by species, MO, NC, OK, and TN (See Figure 1). Several southern sites have averaged across the state, and **3)** Percent decline, by species, averaged across the state. confirmed the presence of *G. destructans*, without the manifestation For data that was submitted, if raw numbers were provided, percent decline by species was of WNS. Consequently, many sites have not documented the high calculated. All data was input into a master spreadsheet. Individual graphs were generated for mortality found in the northeast US. Additionally, some southern each species to display percent decline. Within these graphs, states were arranged north to species, such as the Virginia big-eared bat (Corynorhinus townsendii south to detect any trends by latitude. virginianus), a federally listed endangered species, have not displayed Finally, as the collection of this data varied significantly among states, we collected a list of the pathogen mediated damage associated with WNS, despite their caveats associated with these data. suspected vulnerability to infection and exposure to the fungus. Recent research has demonstrated that WNS impacts different Results species in different ways, and to different degrees (Langwig et al. Data were collected from 14 of the 19 WNS-positive states: NH, VT, NY, MA, PA, IN, NJ, DE, WV, 2012). This research suggests that habitat variables, such as MD, VA, KY, TN, and NC. We were unable to obtain data from OH or ME. Data were collected temperature and humidity, and social behavior, such as clustering, for 6 species: Myotis lucifugus, M. sodalis, M. septentrionalis, M. leibii, Eptesicus fuscus, and may impact fungal growth, host immune function and spore *Perimyotis subflavus*. However, due to the broad geographic range of data collected, not every transmission. Geographical variation in sociality and behavior size is state had count data on each species. Data were most complete for *M. lucifugus* (10 of 14 well documented in bats (Barbour and Davis 1969). This, coupled states); the least-sampled species was *M. leibii* (5 of 14 states). Four species appear to have with site-specific climactic variation, may produce areas of reduced lower rates of decline at southerly latitudes: *M. lucifugus, M. septentrionalis, M. sodalis,* and *P.* WNS-caused fatality. As such, the southeastern US may provide areas subflavus (See figures below). of refuge from this disease; such sites need prioritized protection if they are to act as reservoirs for future populations. We sought to Myotis lucifugus cententrionali Little brown bat compile WNS fatality data from across the range of the disease to identify latitudinal trends in mortality. We also identify actions that resource managers can take to protect bats in light of this disease.









Methods





Discussion

This was the first compilation and examination of survey data for the six disease-impacted species across the range of WNS. Four species (*M*. *lucifugus, M. septentrionalis, M. sodalis, and P. subflavis*) appear to have lower rates of decline at southern latitudes. This is not uniform, however. Note that while some species are showing increases in some states (*M*. *lucifugus* and *M. sodalis* in KY), others states are showing declines that are comparable to the north (*M. sodalis* and *P. subflavis* in VA). This data is preliminary and, was collated *a posteriori*, so caution must be taken. As several state biologists noted, data collection prior to WNS was opportunistic and may not be representative of population levels. Biologists in TN stated that pre-WNS estimates for *M. lucifigus* were based on counts at 3 sites, whereas post-WNS estimates were from 18 sites. A trend may appear due to low sample sizes, versus actual population decline. For example, pre-WNS counts were ≥ 100 individuals for *M. leibii* in 5 of the 7 reporting states (MA, PA, WV, MD, and KY). Additionally, NC warned that averaging percent decline diluted the mortality impacts at WNS-positive sites, where declines were as high as 81%. Finally, the latency period for WNS may be as high as 1-2 years; as such, the clinical signs of fatality may be underestimated, as WNS has only been present on the southern landscape for up to 3 years. Possibly, the rate of spread and/or severity of impacts in the south could be less due to milder winters and other factors, but that is yet to be determined. Although the data suggests reduced mortality at southern sites for 4 species – *M. lucifugus,* M. sodalis, M. septentrionalis, and P. subflavis, additional surveys and data collection is required to determine if southern sites provide a refugia from WNS.

Management Recommendations

WNS is a recently emergent wildlife disease. The novelty of WNS, coupled with the rapid spread, has left researchers with little time to develop new technologies to prevent bat-bat transmission or eradicate *G. destructans* from natural reservoirs. Current control strategies specifically target human-environmental transmission. It is imperative that southeastern resource managers take action to provide critical protections for bats. Individuals need to be as healthy as possible when facing the disease in the hibernating months.

- Minimize disturbance at hibernacula by regulating human entry Protect known hibernacula with bat-friendly gates
- Require USFWS-approved decontamination in scientific collection permits and underground survey efforts
- Identify and protect maternity roosts
- Where populations are roost limited, provide artificial roosting options Encourage safe exclusions and provide alternate roosts

Acknowledgements





BCI and the SBDN thank the 14 states, identified below, for providing data and review of this presentation. This research was supported in part by the USFWS Arkansas multi-state SWG U2-6-R-1.

