

Long-legged myotis

Myotis volans

Class: Mammalia

Order: Chiroptera

Conservation Status

NatureServe: Agency:

G Rank: G4G5

BLM:

IUCN: Least Concern

Audubon AK:

S Rank: S2

USFWS:

ADF&G: Species of Greatest Conservation Need

Final Rank		
Conservation category: IV. Orange		
IV = unknown status and high biological vulnerability and action need		
<u>Category</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
Status:	-20 to 20	0
Biological:	-50 to 50	3
Action:	-40 to 40	40
Higher numerical scores denote greater concern		

Status - variables measure the trend in a taxon's population status or distribution. Higher status scores denote taxa with known declining trends. Status scores range from -20 (increasing) to 20 (decreasing).

	Score
<i>Population Trend (-10 to 10)</i>	0
Unknown.	
<i>Distribution Trend (-10 to 10)</i>	0
Unknown. Additional research is needed to determine the impacts of deforestation on distribution and habitat availability (Parker 1996).	
Status Total:	0

Biological - variables measure aspects of a taxon's distribution, abundance and life history. Higher biological scores suggest greater vulnerability to extirpation. Biological scores range from -50 (least vulnerable) to 50 (most vulnerable).

	Score
<i>Population Size (-10 to 10)</i>	0
Unknown. This species is infrequently captured (Parker et al. 1997; Boland et al. 2009a; Olson and Fiely 2014) and acoustic calls are difficult to distinguish from other species (Slough et al. 2014).	
<i>Range Size (-10 to 10)</i>	-2
Found on islands and mainland of southeast Alaska, including Prince of Wales, Wrangell, and Admiralty Islands (Parker et al. 1997; MacDonald and Cook 2009). The northern-most records for the state are in Skagway and near Haines (Olson and Fiely 2014). Estimated range size is between 10,001 and 100,000 sq. km.	
<i>Population Concentration (-10 to 10)</i>	0
Unknown. Occurrence records in the state are limited and very little information is available on maternity colonies or hibernacula. Elsewhere in North America, reproductive females congregate at maternity colonies, which may include up to several hundred individuals (Baker and Lacki 2006; Hayes and Wiles 2013).	
<i>Reproductive Potential</i>	
<u>Age of First Reproduction (-5 to 5)</u>	-5
Can potentially give birth within their first year if they are in good enough body condition, but reproduction may be delayed until their second year in colder climates (Warner and Czaplewski 1984; Nagorsen and Brigham	

1993; Frick et al. 2010b).	
Number of Young (-5 to 5)	4
Females give birth to a single pup, but may not reproduce every year if resources are scarce or if they are in poor body condition (Nagorsen and Brigham 1993; Frick et al. 2010b). The proportion of females that forego reproduction in a given year is unknown. To reflect this uncertainty, we rank this question as $0.5 * A + 0.5 * B$.	
<i>Ecological Specialization</i>	
Dietary (-5 to 5)	1
No data available for Alaska. Elsewhere in their range, moths are an important part of their diet, though other invertebrate groups such as termites, flies, beetles, and spiders are also consumed (Warner 1985; Saunders and Barclay 1992; Johnson et al. 2007b; Ober and Hayes 2008). Because invertebrates are an ephemeral and potentially unpredictable food source, we rank this question as B- Moderately adaptable with key requirements common.	
Habitat (-5 to 5)	5
Few data available for Alaska. The availability of appropriate roosting habitat likely restricts them to old-growth forests or other forests with medium- to large-diameter trees and large snags (Johnson et al. 2007b; Hayes and Wiles 2013; Olson and Fiely 2014). Day roosts and maternity colonies are typically found in crevices and under bark of trees and snags and in rock crevices (Vonhof and Barclay 1996; Baker and Lacki 2006; Johnson et al. 2007b). At night, they forage over open habitats such as creeks, ponds, and along cliffs (Saunders and Barclay 1992; Boland et al. 2009a). To our knowledge, hibernacula have not been discovered in Alaska, though they have been found hibernating in caves elsewhere (Hayes and Wiles 2013).	
Biological Total:	3
 Action - variables measure current state of knowledge or extent of conservation efforts directed toward a given taxon. Higher action scores denote greater information needs due of lack of knowledge or conservation action. Action scores range from -40 (lower needs) to 40 (greater needs).	
	Score
<hr/>	
Management Plans and Regulations (-10 to 10)	10
No direct management in Alaska.	
Knowledge of Distribution and Habitat (-10 to 10)	10
The distribution and habitat use of the long-legged myotis in Alaska is poorly understood (Parker et al. 1997). This species is infrequently captured during mist-net surveys (Boland et al. 2009a; Olson and Fiely 2014) and acoustic calls are difficult to differentiate from other species (Slough et al. 2014).	
Knowledge of Population Trends (-10 to 10)	10
Bats in southeast Alaska are currently being monitored by ADF&G using road surveys and acoustic monitoring stations. However, this species is rarely detected and acoustic calls are difficult to differentiate from other species (Slough et al. 2014). Available data are so limited that we rank this question as A- Not currently monitored.	
Knowledge of Factors Limiting Populations (-10 to 10)	10
Little is known about this species' biology and ecology in Alaska. Research is needed to assess ecological requirements, demographic parameters, winter ecology, and vulnerability to white-nose syndrome. Because this species is closely associated with large-diameter trees and snags, timber harvest may affect habitat availability and behavior (Parker 1996).	
Action Total:	40
 Supplemental Information - variables do not receive numerical scores. Instead, they that are used to sort taxa to answer specific biological or management questions.	

Harvest:	None or Prohibited
Seasonal Occurrence:	Year-round
Taxonomic Significance:	Monotypic species
% Global Range in Alaska:	<10%
% Global Population in Alaska:	<25%
Peripheral:	Yes

References

- Baker, M. D., and M. J. Lacki. 2006. Day-roosting habitat of female long-legged myotis in ponderosa pine forests. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 70(1):207-215. DOI: 10.2193/0022-541X(2006)70[207:DHOFLM]2.0.CO;2
- Boland, J. L., W. P. Smith, and J. P. Hayes. 2009a. Survey of bats in southeast Alaska with emphasis on Keen's myotis (*Myotis keenii*). *Northwest Science* 83(3):169-179. DOI: 10.3955/046.083.0301
- Frick, W. F., D. S. Reynolds, and T. H. Kunz. 2010b. Influence of climate and reproductive timing on demography of little brown myotis *Myotis lucifugus*. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 79(1):128-136. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2009.01615.x
- Hayes, G., and G. J. Wiles. 2013. Washington bat conservation plan. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Wildlife Program, Olympia, WA, USA. Available online: <https://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/01504>
- Johnson, J. S., M. J. Lacki, and M. D. Baker. 2007b. Foraging ecology of long-legged myotis (*Myotis volans*) in north-central Idaho. *Journal of Mammalogy* 88(5):1261-1270. DOI: 10.1644/06-MAMM-A-254R1.1
- MacDonald, S. O., and J. A. Cook. 2009. Recent mammals of Alaska. University of Alaska Press, Fairbanks, AK, USA.
- Nagorsen, D. W., and R. M. Brigham. 1993. Bats of British Columbia. UBC Press, Vancouver, BC, CAN.
- Ober, H. K., and J. P. Hayes. 2008. Prey selection by bats in forests of western Oregon. *Journal of Mammalogy* 89(5):1191-1200. DOI: 10.1644/08-MAMM-A-025.1
- Olson, L. E., and J. L. Fiely. 2014. Bats of KLGO and the Taiya Inlet Watershed: Survey results 2013-2014, with notes on habits and roosts. Natural Resource Data Series, National Park Service, Fort Collins, CO, USA. Available online: <https://irma.nps.gov/>
- Parker, D. I. 1996. Forest ecology and distribution of bats in Alaska. MSc thesis, University of Alaska Fairbanks, AK, USA.
- Parker, D. I., B. E. Lawhead, and J. A. Cook. 1997. Distributional limits of bats in Alaska. *Arctic* 50(3):256-265. DOI: 10.14430/arctic1107
- Saunders, M. B., and R. M. R. Barclay. Ecomorphology of insectivorous bats: A test of predictions using two morphologically similar species. *Ecology* 73(4):1335-1345. DOI: 10.2307/1940680
- Slough, B. G., T. S. Jung, and C. L. Lausen. 2014. Acoustic surveys reveal hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus*) and long-legged myotis (*Myotis volans*) in Yukon. *Northwestern Naturalist* 95(3):176-185. DOI: 10.1898/13-08.1
- Vonhof, M. J., and R. M. R. Barclay. 1996. Roost-site selection and roosting ecology of forest-dwelling bats in southern British Columbia. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 74(10):1797-1805. DOI: 10.1139/z96-200
- Warner, R. M. 1985. Interspecific and temporal dietary variation in an Arizona bat community. *Journal of Mammalogy* 66(1):45-51. DOI: 10.2307/1380954
- Warner, R. M., and N. J. Czaplewski. 1984. *Myotis volans*. *Mammalian Species* 224:1-4. DOI: 10.2307/3503923

Version date: 19 December 2017

Alaska Center for Conservation Science
Alaska Natural Heritage Program
University of Alaska Anchorage
Anchorage, AK