

**Amphibian/Reptile Break-Out Group Notes
Maine Wildlife Action Plan Meeting #1 (July 8, 2014)**

Facilitators: Derek Yorks (MDIFW) and Amanda Shearin (MDIFW)

Note Takers: Derek Yorks, Amanda Shearin, Faren Wolter (UMO)

In general, the group felt the designation process and species lists were appropriate. Specific comments are below:

Designation process discussion

- Why was Maine's 'Species of Special Concern' status not included under Criteria 1?
- There was quite a bit of discussion regarding climate change vulnerability as a criterion.
 - Why is climate change the only 'threat' used in the designation process?
 - Are other threats (e.g., habitat loss) already included by default (i.e., a species would not be listed as 'endangered' if it was not already suffering from some sort of threat) or do these threats need to be explicitly included? Is there a way to rework climate change into something more general, such as habitat or life cycle vulnerability?
 - Include more description for this criterion rather than just a reference to the Whitman et al. 2013 document.
 - Why was climate change vulnerability included in the listing process rather than elsewhere in the plan?
 - Should climate change threats alone be enough to propel a species to SGCN priority 2?

SGCN list discussion

- We discussed some species in detail that were not included on the SGCN lists:
 - smooth green snake
 - four-toed salamander
- In general, it might be useful to provide a one-line explanation for species that were not included, especially if there is a specific inquiry during the revision process.
- Black racers will benefit most from habitat management.
- Why were fairy shrimp not included on the invert list?
- Mink frogs are the only species on the list due to climate change. There was discussion regarding their distribution and association with cold-water habitats.

General discussion

- How do we include landowners that have already developed their parcels in SGCN conservation discussions? In many regions, these landowners are more abundant than those that have not yet developed their land.
- There needs to be more transparency during the implementation phase; this was lacking in the 2005 plan.

- SWG grants need to be tied closely to conservation actions.
- We need to keep the door open for listing additional species as SGCN.
- How do we prioritize our conservation actions?
- How can we message SGCN issues in a positive way? How can we engage the public on SGCN herps in a positive or proactive manner rather than just through environmental review, neighbors telling each other about botched subdivisions, etc.?

Participants

- Faren Wolter (University of Maine, Orono)
- Judy Gates (Maine Department of Transportation)
- Sarah Demers (MDIFW)
- Cyndy Loftin(USGS Cooperative Research Unit)
- Kelly Boland (USFWS)
- Barbara Charry (Maine Audubon)
- Rich Jordan (Maine Association of Wetland Scientists)
- Mark McCollough (USFWS)
- Derek Yorks (MDIFW)
- Amanda Shearin (MDIFW)