# 2004 Camera Trap Survey at Guthrie-Bancroft Parcel, Colby Hill, Lincoln, Vermont

# J. Decher Colby Hill Ecological Project

#### Introduction

For the first time in 2004 an automatic camera trap was used successfully at the Guthrie-Bancroft parcel to obtain images of wildlife from different localities. This adds another more visual, non-invasive survey technique, particularly for medium and large size mammals, to confirm data obtained from the track survey routes. Camera traps have come into more serious scientific use since about the mid 1990's (Sunquist 1997). Recently several international scientific journals have published articles based on camera trap results (Maffei et al., 2004, Silver et al. 2004, Súquin et al. 2003).

### **Materials and Methods**

The camera employed is the standard film-based "Wildlife Pro Camera System" developed by Camtrakker (http://www.camtrakker.com/) and purchased through Forestry Suppliers, Inc. It uses a modified Yashica T4 point-and—shoot camera with a high quality Carl Zeiss Vario-Tessar T\* 28-70mm, F 4.5-8.0 Zoom lens, although the lens is only used at the wide-angle (28 mm) end in order to fit into the waterproof housing. The camera has a built-in flash, which has a separate window in the weatherproof housing, a date or time imprint option and it runs on 4 C-cell batteries located in the housing. I used Fuji or Kodak 200 ASA 35mm color print film with 24 exposures. Camera trapping was started in May when nights were mostly frost-free. This year's survey was designed to test the capability of such a camera system in a number of locations which were subjectively considered "good spots" frequented by wildlife. At most locations a commercial lure (Fisher - *Martes pennanti* - paste) was used.

#### Results

Camera trapping lasted from 19 May until 11 November 2004. The camera was used at 14 different locations (see Appendix 1 and 3). Camera checks took place every 7-14 days. Eleven 24-exposure rolls of color print film were removed from the camera after

partial exposure, i.e. whenever the number of exposures appeared to exceed the number of test shots that were taken routinely upon arrival and departure from the camera trap. Twenty-one exposures were triggered by wildlife, 18 by mammals and 3 by birds (see photos, Appendix 2). Table 1 presents an overview of the number of photographs per species.

	G A 140 N		Number of				
Common Name	Scientific Name	Order, Family	<b>Photographs</b>				
M a m m a l s							
Black Bear	Ursus americanus	Carnivora, Ursidae	9				
Raccoon	Procyon lotor	Carnivora, Procyonidae	1				
Coyote	Canis latrans	Carnivora, Canidae	1				
Moose	Alces alces	Artiodactyla, Cervidae	5				
East. Cottontail	Sylvilagus floridanus	Lagomorpha, Leporidae	1				
Deer or White- footed Mouse	Peromyscus sp.	Rodentia, Muridae	1				
Birds							
Wild Turkey	Meleagris gallopavo	Galliformes, Phasianidae	1				
Ruffed Grouse	Bonasa umbellus	Galliformes, Phasianidae	1				
White-breasted Nuthatch	Sitta carolinensis	Passeriformes, Sittidae	1				

<u>Table 1:</u> Wildlife recorded by one camera trap moved between 14 locations at Guthrie–Bancroft parcel, Colby Hill, Lincoln, from 19 May and 11 November 2004.

### Discussion

These first results from a single camera placed in more or less arbitrary locations at the Guthrie-Bancroft parcel attest to the capability and the amount of detail that can be obtained from automated photographic recording devices. Many photos show details that make it possible to identify individual animals if several camera traps were to be used in a more statistically rigorous design. Recently developed camera trapping techniques have even been used for making mark- recapture estimates of individually identifiable animals by using several cameras in a grid system (Carbone et al. 2001,

Silver et al. 2004). Long-term monitoring of three or four ecosystems with small mammal traps could easily be coupled with the simultaneous use of several (3+?) camera traps in future years. Other baits should also be tried based on recent experiences from a camera trap survey in Vermont's Northeast Kingdom, which used several more affordable types of camera traps with good results (L. Farrell and C. W. Kilpatrick pers. comm.). Bait type and camera position should be fine-tuned to capture more pictures of medium-sized mammals such as fisher, weasels, mink, skunk and porcupine.

## Acknowledgments

Field assistance in 2004 was provided by Holly Cook, Sophie Decher, Matthew Kolan and Alexander Matthias. Laura Farrell provided helpful suggestions for recent literature on camera trap surveys. We are grateful for financial support of this survey through the Colby Hill Ecological Project Fund.

#### Literature Cited

- Carbone, C., S. Christie, K. Conforti, T. Coulson, N. Franklin, J. R. Ginsberg, M.
  Griffiths, J. Holden, K. Kawanishi, M. Kinnaird, R. Laidlaw, A. Lynam, D. W.
  Macdonald, D. Martyr, C. McDougal, L. Nath, T. O'Brien, J. Seidensticker, D. J.
  L. Smith, M. Sunquist, R. Tilson, and W. N. W. Shahruddin. 2001. The use of photographic rates to estimate densities of tigers and other cryptic mammals.
  Animal Conservation 4::75-79.
- Maffei L., E. CuÚllar, A. Noss. 2004 One thousand jaguars (*Panthera onca*) in Bolivia's Chaco? Camera trapping in the Kaa-Iya National Park. Journal of Zoology 262:295-304.
- Silver S. C, L. E. T. Ostro, L. K. Marsh, L. Maffei, A. J. Noss, M. J. Kelly, R. B. Wallace, H. Gomez, and G. Ayala. 2004. The use of camera traps for estimating jaguar *Panthera onca* abundance and density using capture/recapture analysis. Oryx 38:148-154.
- Sunquist, F. 1997. Caught in the trap! Remote cameras with electronic beams are the newest tools for biologists investigating mysteries in the wild. International Wildlife, Nov-Dec. 1997 (Full text at URL: <a href="http://www.nwf.org/internationalwildlife/camtrap.html">http://www.nwf.org/internationalwildlife/camtrap.html</a>)
- Súquin E. S, M. M. Jaeger, P. F. Brussard, and R. H. Barrett. 2003. Wariness of coyotes to camera traps relative to social status and territory boundaries. Canadian

Journal of Zoology 81: 81:2015-2025.

Appendix 1

2004 Camera Trap Locations at Guthrie-Bancroft Parcel with Coordinates, Ecosystems, and Wildlife photographed

Location	Period	Coordinate	Ecosystem	Bait	Results
Code					
CA01	19 May – 28 May	44°08'57.4"N, 73°01'05.3"W	ES 4	yes	Wild Turkey
CA02	28 May – 4 June	44°09'57.4"N, 73°01'05.6"W	ES4	yes	-
CA03	4 June – 12 Jun	44°08'58.2"N, 73°01'05.8"W	ES 4	yes	Black bear
CA04	12 Jun – 18 Jun	44°08'58.3"N, 73°01'04.2"W	ES 4	?	Black bear
CA05	18 Jun – 26 Jun	44°08'53.8"N, 73°01'07.0"W	ES 14	?	-
CA06	26 Jun – 6 Jul	44°08'55.6"N, 73°01'01.2"W	ES 14	yes	-
CA07	6 Jul – 20 Jul	44°08'56.1"N, 73°01'02.1"W	ES 4	yes	Coyote, Raccoon
CA08	20 Jul-11 Aug	44°09'08.6"N, 73°01'28.7"W	ES 20	yes	Black Bear, Moose, Ruffed Grouse
CA09	11 Aug – 27 Aug	44°09'09.9"N, 73°01'28.9"W	ES 2	yes	Black Bear, Eastern Cottontail
CA10	27 Aug – 18 Sept	44°09'08.5"N, 73°01'47.7"W	ES 10 (creek)	?	-
CA11	18 Sep – 8 Oct	44°09'08.3"N, 73°01'45.9"W	ES 10 (creek)	yes	-
CA12	8 Oct – 22 Oct	44°09'11.0"N, 73°01'23.0"W	ES 12	yes	-
			(Amer. Chestnut)		
CA13	22 Oct – 11 Nov	44°09'11.2"N, 73°01'14.4"W	ES 21/14	yes	Peromyscus sp., White-breasted
			(Stone wall)		Nuthatch

# Appendix 2

# **Camera Trap Images**

# 1. Mammals



Fig. 1. Ursus americanus (American Black Bear)
Date: 8 Jun 2004 Location Code: 04CA03
GPS: 44°08'57.5"N, 73°01'08.1"W, ES 14



Fig. 2 Ursus americanus (American Black Bear)
Date: 14 Jun 2004 Location Code: 04CA04
GPS: 44°08'58.3"N, 73°01'04.2"W, ES 14



Fig. 3 Ursus americanus (Black Bear)

Date: 20 July 2004 Location Code: 04CA08



Fig 4 Ursus americanus (Black Bear)

Date: 20 July 2004 Location Code: 04CA08

GPS: 44°09'08.6''N, 73°01'28.7"W Habitat: Edge of Beaver Pond, ES 20



Fig. 5 Ursus americanus (Black Bear)

Date: 31 July 2004 Location Code: 04CA08



Fig. 6 Ursus americanus (Black Bear)

Date: 17 Aug 2004 Location Code: 04CA09

GPS: 44°09'09.9"N, 73°01'28.9"W Habitat: West Side of Beaver Pond, ES 2



Fig. 7 Canis latrans (Coyote)

Date: 9 July 2004 Location Code: 04CA07

GPS: 44°08'56.1"N, 73°01'02.1"W Habitat: ES 4, Old Logging Road



Fig. 8 Procyon lotor (Raccoon)

Date: 13 July 2004 Location Code: 04CA07.

GPS: 44°08'56.1"N, 73°01'02.1"W Old Logging Road, ES 4



Fig. 9 Alces alces (Moose)

Date: 20 July 2004 Location Code: 04CA08



Fig. 10 Alces alces (Moose)

Date: 21 July 2004 Location Code: 04CA08

GPS: 44°09'08.6"N, 73°01'28.7"W Edge of Beaver Pond, ES 20



Fig 11 Alces alces (Moose)

Date: 21 July 2004 Location Code: 04CA08



Fig. 12 a Alces alces (Moose)

Date: 21 July 2004 Location Code: 04CA08



**Fig. 12 b** *Alces alces* (Moose) Same as above, showing detail with sores and gun (arrow) shot scar (behind leaves).



Fig. 13 Alces alces (Moose)

Date: 21 July 2004 Location Code: 04CA08

GPS: 44°09'08.6"N, 73°01'28.7"W Edge of Beaver Pond, ES 20



Fig. 14 Sylvilagus floridanus (Eastern Cottontail)

Date: 16 Aug 2004 Location Code: 04CA09

GPS: 44°09'09.9"N, 73°01'28.9"W West Side of Beaver Pond, ES2



Fig. 15 Peromyscus sp. (Deer our White-footed Mouse)
Date: 24 Oct 2004 Location Code: 04CA14
GPS: 44°09'11.2"N, 73°01'14.4"W

Hedgerow / Stonewall dividing large meadow, ES 14 / ES 21

# 2. Birds



Fig. 16. Meleagris gallopavo (Wild Turkey)
Date: 20 May 2004 Location Code: 04CA01
GPS: 44°08'57.4"N, 73°01'05.3"W, ES 14



Fig. 17. Bonasus umbellus (Ruffed Grouse)

Date: 11 Aug 2004 Location Code: 04CA08



Fig. 18 White-breasted Nuthatch (Sitta carolinensis)
Location Code: 04CA13 GPS: 44°09'11.2"N, 73°01'14.4"W
Hedgerow / stonewall dividing large meadow ES 14 / ES 21



**Fig. 19** Mammalogist *(Homo sapiens scientificensis)* testing camera trap. Invasive species. Location Code: 04CA04 18 June 04 GPS: 44°08'53.8"N, 73°01'07.0"W, ES 14