# DIVERSIFICATION of CLEARCUTS

Woody Debris Structures Tree and Patch Retention Riparian Systems



Mustelids & Small Mammals

# Marten and Weasels

Maintenance of furbearer populations and their prey species is a major goal of wildlife conservation in BC. The American marten and short-tailed weasel (ermine) are small mustelids and common inhabitants of forests. Marten occupy forest landscape mosaics that include older (> 80 years) conifer-dominated stands with relatively high levels of canopy closure (minimum of 30% -50%), particularly spruce and true firs, as well as riparian forests. A major prey species for marten is the southern red-backed vole which is an important indicator species of closed-canopy forests. The short-tailed weasel is broadly distributed in various forest successional stages, edge habitats, and riparian woodlands where dense understory vegetation provides habitats for small mammal prey, particularly microtine voles. The long-tailed weasel also occupies these habitats and has a wider range of prey species that include voles and other less common rodent and avian species.





Red-backed vole.

Long-tailed vole.

Large openings in forests created by clearcutting has reduced the abundance of small mustelids because of a loss of preferred prey species, cover, and other components of stand structure. Loss of security cover on clearcuts, in particular, is crucial as these mustelids may be prey species for other carnivores. In terms of a major prey species, the red-backed vole also disappears from clearcuts within a year of harvest, presumably because of a loss of food and cover and does not return to abundance levels of mature or old-growth forest for many decades after clearcutting. However, other forest-floor small mammals such as the deer mouse, chipmunk, some species of microtine voles, and shrews occur as habitat generalists on clearcuts for variable periods. Regenerated forests take many decades to provide sufficient habitat for furbearer species and their prey. Thus, habitat creation is much needed in these large openings to provide food and cover during the many decades of forest recovery.

What enhancements of stand structure could be done at the time of clearcutting to provide food and cover for mustelids and prey species?

- (1) Woody debris structures
- (3) Riparian systems
- (2) Tree and patch retention (4) A combination of structural retention treatments.

# Woody Debris Structures

Both marten and weasels use woody debris structures as cover, den sites, travel corridors, and focal points for finding prey species such as the red-backed vole and other small mammals.



Short-tailed weasel in debris pile.



Long-tailed weasel in debris pile.

Structures built from post-harvest woody debris (e.g., piles and windrows) at the time of forest harvesting and log processing, or immediately thereafter, have generated some important networks for mustelids and prey species. Woody debris structures need to be large-scale: at least 2 m in height and 5-7 m in width or diameter, arranged as continuous windrows or in a linear array of piles, to provide sufficient habitat for forest-floor small mammals and their predators on clearcuts.





Excavator building structures after harvest completed.

## Woody Debris Structures on Large Clearcuts

Four project areas (2 at Golden and 2 at Summerland) compared linear arrays of debris piles with dispersed woody debris on new large (30-50 ha) clearcuts. After 2 years post-construction of piles, responses of small mustelids to debris piles was 6.7 times higher in piles than dispersed debris. Counts of activity (observations, scats, predation) included 70 weasels and 14 marten in piles; and 12 weasels and 0 marten in dispersed debris. Responses of small mammal prey species also followed this pattern. Mustelid activity and total small mammal populations were similar across the linear array of piles on these large clearcut units.



Mustelid activity in sites with woody debris in dispersed and piles on large clearcut openings (mean ± 95% CIs).

## Longevity of Responses

In terms of longevity of responses, red-backed voles and associated small mammals will persist in debris structures for at least 12 years, at or near abundance levels found in uncut forest. At least some mammalian carnivores will presumably continue to use these structures for this same period.



Longevity of woody debris structures for (a+b) piles and (c+d) windrows constructed in 2006 and 12 years later in 2018. Connectivity of piles and a windrow (e) across a forest plantation in 2018 are indicated with arrows



Mean number of total small mammals in the dispersed, piles, windrow, and forest sites up to 12 years after construction.

# **Options for Construction of Debris Structures**

Establishment of these habitat networks is site-specific for wherever connectivity among forest reserves and patches is required. On sites with substantial debris, these structures may use only 10-15% of excess post-harvest woody debris, thereby leaving material for other uses such as biofuels and alternative functions. Piles of post-harvest

Structural Retention on Clearcuts Diversification of new clearcuts with a range of structural retention was investigated for responses of mustelid activity and prey populations in a study west of Summerland, BC from 2017-2020.

woody debris in a linear configuration already dominate forest harvesting regimes on clearcuts and conservation of this debris provides immediate habitat for various mammal species.



Several options for construction of woody debris habitats. (a) Poorest option - minimal vertical structure to habitat (b) Good option - piles (c) Better option - linear array of piles (d) Best option - piles connecting to riparian (e) Best option - piles connecting to forest

What to do, when, and where during the creation of habitat structures and connectivity via debris piles.

## WHEN

During harvesting/log processing Situations where biofuel production is not viable On sites where seedling microsites are limited Cutblocks < 10 ha CWD should be evenly distributed vs piled Cutblocks with average distances between forest edges < 50 m need not have piles

#### WHERE TO PLACE

Connect residual patches to each other or riparian areas In areas remote from human activity to reduce fire risk Preferably on roads perpendicular to the main haul roads Particularly important on  $\geq$  10-ha openings In areas requiring protection from soil erosion at road ways Avoid vole "hot-spots" due to seedling predation

#### **CHARACTERISTICS**

2 m in height + 5-7 m in width or diameter  $\geq$  1 windrow or series of piles per 10 ha of cutblock Leave openings every 100 m for ungulates and silvicultural activity On large, wide cutblocks (> 50 m) connectivity should include patches/riparian to cross wide areas On irregularly shaped cutblocks use narrower portions of cutblock Piles should be 5 m from forest or riparian edges

# **STUDY DESIGN**

#### Dispersed • Piles • Riparian • Green-tree retention • Uncut forest



Five treatment sites in the study of structural retention on new clearcuts. (a) Dispersed (b) Piles of woody debris (c) Riparian (d) Green-tree retention (e) Uncut forest

Abundance of herbaceous vegetation was 5 to 13 times higher in the riparian than the other sites. Abundance of shrubs was 3 to 35 times higher in the riparian than the other sites.



Herbs, shrubs, and conifers in riparian zone.

Structural diversity of herbs and shrubs was similar in the riparian, dispersed, and uncut forest but 3 to 4 times higher than in the piles and GTR. Structural diversity of understory conifers was highest in the uncut forest and riparian sites.

Activity of mustelids was statistically similar (P = 0.10) among sites. However, in terms of overall mustelid activity, the piles and riparian sites had 2.0 to 4.0 and 1.8 to 3.7 times as many counts, respectively, as the other three sites and this result likely has biological significance. Counts of activity (observations, scats, predation) included 82 weasels and 6 marten.



Mustelid activity on new clearcuts (mean ± SEs).

Mean abundance of total small mammals was significantly different among sites with consistently higher numbers (1.4 to 2.0 times) in the piles than other sites. Mean annual peak numbers of total mammals reached 32 and 26 per line in 2017 and 2019, respectively, in the piles sites.



Mean number of total small mammals.

#### **Combined Structures**

(piles + riparian + green-tree retention)

Mean presence of mustelids was statistically similar (P = 0.08) among the combined structural treatments and the dispersed and uncut forest sites. It is likely biologically important that the overall mean mustelid presence in the combined treatments was 2.9 and 1.4 times higher than that in the dispersed and uncut forest sites, respectively.



#### Mustelid activity in the dispersed, combined retention , and uncut forest (mean ± 95% CIs).

Similarly, mean total abundance, species richness, and species diversity were all significantly different among sites with the combined retention sites at a range of 1.3 to 1.6 times higher than the dispersed and uncut forest sites.



## Forest Patch Retention

Loss of habitat for mustelids and prey species may also be ameliorated by aggregated retention harvests that leave unlogged patches on clearcuts. A comparison of mustelid activity and prey populations in four sizes (ha) of retention patches (means of 0.53, 1.50, 4.13, and 18.73) was conducted near Elkhart, BC during 2014-2016.





Landscape view of forest patch retention among clearcuts.

Interior of forest patch.

Activity of mustelids was similar among the different-sized patch sites with overall mean counts ranging from 0.83 to 1.50. Counts of activity (observations, scats, predation) included 34 weasels and 15 marten over the 3-year period.

Overall abundance of red-backed voles was similar among sites and ranged from 3 to 5 per line. This prey species was extirpated on clearcut sites (i.e., no forest patches). Overall abundance of total forest-floor small mammals was also similar among sites and ranged from 7 to 10 per line.



# Conclusions

- On large clearcuts, activity of small mustelids was 6.7 times higher in woody debris piles than dispersed debris. Responses of small mammal prey species also followed this pattern. Mustelid activity and abundance of prey species were similar among piles across the length of these clearcuts.
- In terms of longevity of responses, red-backed voles and associated small mammals will persist in debris structures for at least 12 years, at or near abundance levels found in uncut forest.
- Abundance of herbaceous and shrub vegetation was substantially higher in riparian than other sites. Structural diversity of understory conifers was highest in uncut forest and riparian sites. Activity of mustelids and abundance of total small mammals was highest in the combined retention sites.
- Among unlogged patches on clearcuts, activity of mustelids and total abundance of small mammal prey were similar among different-sized patch sites.

# Management of Woody Debris

The current forest management system of disposing of excess post-harvest woody debris by burning is exacerbating climate change by releasing greenhouse gases into the atmosphere and causing a human health problem.

In terms of wildfire risk, there is no scientific evidence showing that post-harvest debris piles are ignition points for forest fires, other than those caused by humans.

This practice removes biomass that could be used for bioenergy production and habitat for wildlife, thereby compromising our attempts to conserve wildlife and biodiversity in managed forests.

#### References

- British Columbia Fisher Habitat and Forestry Web Module. 2018. Fisher Habitat Working Group, www.bcfisherhabitat.ca (Accessed December 2020).
- Lisgo K.A., Bunnell, F.L., Harestad, A.S., 2002. Summer and fall use of logging residue piles by female short-tailed weasels. USDA For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-181. Pp. 319-330.
- Seip, C., Hodder, D., Crowley, S., Johnson, C., 2018. Use of constructed coarse woody debris corridors in a clearcut by American mortens (Martes americana) and their prey. Forestry 91, 506-513.
- Sullivan, T.P., Sullivan, D.S., 2018. Maintenance of small mammals using postharvest woody debris structures on clearcuts: Linear configuration of piles is comparable to windrows. Mammal Research 63, 11-19.
- Sullivan, T.P., Sullivan, D.S., 2019. Long-term functionality of woody debris structures for forest-floor small mammals on clearcuts. Forest Ecology and Management 451, 117535.
- Sullivan, T.P., Sullivan, D.S., 2020. Similarity in occupancy of different-sized forest patches by small mammals on clearcuts: Conservation implications for redbacked voles and small mustelids. Mammal Research 65, 255-266.
- Sullivan, T.P., Sullivan, D.S., 2021. Responses of mustelids and small mammal prey to combined retention on clearcuts: Woody debris, green trees, and riparian structures. Submitted to a scientific journal.
- Sullivan, T.P., Sullivan, D.S., Klenner, W., 2021. Fate of post-harvest woody debris, wildlife habitat, and alternative management of forest residues on clearcuts: A synthesis. Submitted to a scientific journal.
- Sullivan, T.P., Sullivan, D.S., Sullivan, J.H., 2017. Mammalian responses to windrows of woody debris on clearcuts: Abundance and diversity of forestfloor small mammals and presence of small mustelids. Forest Ecology and Management 399, 143-154.

#### Acknowledgments

We thank the British Columbia Habitat Conservation Trust Foundation, Forest Enhancement Society of British Columbia, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, Forest Science Program, BC Ministry of Forests, Aspen Planers Ltd., Gold Mountain Mining Corp., Gorman Bros. Lumber Ltd., Jaeden Resources Ltd., Louisiana-Pacific Canada Ltd., Okanagan Innovative Forestry Society (Innovative Forest Practices Association), Tolko Industries Ltd., the Westbank First Nation, Wood Pellet Association of Canada, and the Applied Mammal Research Institute who provided financial and logistical support. T. Ball, S. Bulmer, D. Gill, D. Gossoo, R. Hardy, S. King, K. Rouck, and W. Shibley were particularly helpful in assisting with these projects. We thank H. Sullivan for assistance with the fieldwork. We thank D. Gossoo for photos.



CONSERVATION TRUST FOUNDATION



Forest Enhancement Society of British Columbia

This summary was prepared by:

T.P. Sullivan Department of Forest and Conservation Sciences Faculty of Forestry University of BC Vancouver, BC, V6T 1Z4 Canada tom.sullivan@ubc.ca

Applied Mammal Research Institute Summerland, BC, Canada tom@appliedmammal.com www.appliedmammal.com